

2017 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES

January 18, 2017 Minutes

February 21, 2017 Minutes

March 15, 2017 Minutes

April 19, 2017 Minutes

May 17, 2017 Minutes

June 21, 2017 Minutes

July 19, 2017 Minutes – MEETING CANCELLED

August 16, 2017 Minutes

September 20, 2017 Minutes

October 18, 2017 Minutes

November 15, 2017 Minutes

November 16, 2017 Minutes

December 20, 2017 Minutes

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

**Wednesday, January 18th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein assumes the Chair position at this time, however, as Mr. Vein was unable to attend the meeting in person (but was available via conference call), Mike Powers, Past Chairman, called the January 18th, 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, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Jeannie Mock, Warren Strandell, and Ken Vein (via conference call).

Absent were: 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.

Guests: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Powers declared a quorum was present.

SELECTION OF SECRETARY

Haugen reported that, per the MPO By-Laws, today is Mr. Vein's first day as the Chairman of the MPO Executive Policy Board as Mr. Powers has served his two year term. He explained that with Mr. Vein moving into the Chairman position for a two year term, we need to fill the Secretary position, and per the By-Laws this is rotated between each side of the river, so this two-year term would be for a member from East Grand Forks, and then two years from now that person would be assuming the Chairman position assuming they are still a board member, so the Board needs to make a determination of who they want to assume the Secretary position.

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE NOMINATION OF CLARENCE VETTER FOR THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD SECRETARY POSITION, AND TO CAST A UNANIMOUS BALLOT.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DECEMBER 21ST, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 21ST, 2016, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, there has been prior discussion about changing the agreement for how the decorative lighting can be managed, and that is still in the draft stage. He added that another bit of news is that the original controller was not accepted so he believes that last week a new controller was finally installed. He said that there has been a little bit of retiming of the core decorative lighting schedule required with this change, but now that this has been done the last piece of this project should be completion of the final agreement document on the management of the decorative lighting.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that the project bid was awarded to a firm out of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He stated that MnDOT is in the process of finalizing the contract with that firm, and once that is done they will start scheduling the project.

Haugen commented that they are still working on the signal timing plans for detours, so there is still additional work being done for that project to be accomplished as smoothly as possible.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF OFFICE RENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH THE CITEIS OF EAST GRAND FORKS AND GRAND FORKS

Haugen reported that we do have rental agreements with both City Halls for office space for MPO Employees. He stated that our current agreements did expire at the end of December 2016; thus discussions were held with both cities and copies of the lease agreements that were drafted as a result of those discussions.

Haugen pointed out that the space that we are leasing has not changed, and there has only been a slight cost adjustment based on the current CPI rate. He stated that the agreement is for a two year period, with some additional options, and staff is recommending approval of both lease agreements.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE OFFICE RENTAL AGREEMENTS WITH THE CITIES OF EAST GRAND FORKS AND GRAND FORKS, AS SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 21st, 2016**

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2018-2021 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

a. MN FTA 5339 Capital Program

Kouba reported that the FTA 5339 Program is the bus and bus facilities program. She stated that Minnesota does this slightly different, through their application process that they have towards the end of August in the previous year, which would be in 2016, they have their operators place in what capital improvements they would like to see done, and they chose from those applications for this program.

Kouba explained that MnDOT will be making their decision on these when appropriate and will let the transit operators know, as well as any other agencies, at that time.

Haugen asked if Ms. Kouba knows what East Grand Forks has formally submitted for this program as it is his understanding was that there wasn't anything submitted. Kouba responded that there is no application, and she doesn't think there is anything on their schedule to be putting on there, but they haven't heard.

Haugen stated that they believe there are no candidate projects for consideration. He added that there will be another chance to submit with the April draft, as projects can pop up at odd times.

Information only.

b. TA Program

Viafara reported that staff is seeking approval of one project submitted by the City of East Grand Forks, and he would like to give a brief presentation at this time.

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

Viafara explained that initially there were two projects and they were actually combined into one project so we are now actually seeking approval for just one project that includes an infrastructure portion for sidewalk extensions on 20th Avenue S.E. and 13th Street S.E., and a non-infrastructure portion for Safe Routes To School's Education Program.

Viafara gave a brief overview on what would be covered in the non-infrastructure portion.

Haugen commented that, just to add one component to this, the sidewalk construction is actually one year of physical work, while the Safe Kids portion is a request for three years of funding, so if ATP funds this, it would commit it to two additional years of funding for Safe Kids to work on the East Grand Forks side on their education activities.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE TA PROGRAM PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Grasser.

c. ATP Sub-Targets

Viafara reported that ATP Sub-Target program consists of funding for the County and City. He referred to FY 2018; and explained that the City component has been increased to \$910,000, so this is the amount of monies available for projects.

Haugen commented that due to the FAST Act, just as Grand Forks saw an annual increase in its allocation; on the Minnesota side there is more money coming in so every fourth year an East Grand Forks project is getting an additional \$50,000 to \$60,000 dollars in funding on the federal side to augment what is currently in our T.I.P.

Information only.

d. Recreational Trails

Viafara reported that due to a delay in communication there were no projects submitted for the Recreational Trails program this year.

Information only.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENTS TO THE 2017-2020 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that there are two projects that need to be amended in our current T.I.P. document.

Haugen stated that the first one is highlighted on the project listings and, for the first time that he can recall, is a County project that is being done with federal funds inside the MPO study area. He explained that the project is located on Merrifield Road, basically between Columbia Road out to the Airport Road and involves a mill and overlay.

Haugen commented that the project cost is roughly a half million dollars, and when it showed up in the S.T.I.P. it did so as part of a group of five or six projects that are going on around Grand Forks County, so he will have to add some language to the description explaining that it is one of six projects and that the total cost is four and a half million dollars.

Haugen added that he will also need to add, and he will need direction from the State and Feds on this, is the fact that this project includes advance construction monies. He explained that this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 21st, 2016**

means that essentially Grand Forks County is borrowing future federal funds to pay for a project being done in 2017, so in 2018 we will need to show how this is being paid back, thus he will be seeking guidance as to how to show the advance construction and payback for this project.

Haugen reported that the second project is really just a re-scoping of a currently programmed project on U.S. 81 or North Washington, north of U.S. #2. He explained that the NDDOT, as they went through the project development, changed it from a slurry seal to a chip seal, and our T.I.P. document needs to be amended to reflect that change. He added, though, that the dollar amounts did not change.

Haugen explained that in addition to our having to make these changes to our T.I.P., the State is also having to make some changes to their S.T.I.P. document as well due to an error they made involving the cost estimates on some of the safety projects we were awarded in the past. He added that we do not have to amend our T.I.P. as our figures are correct.

Further discussion on the advance construction project for the County of Grand Forks ensued.

Haugen commented that if the MPO Executive Policy Board does not approve this amendment then he would anticipate that the State and the County of Grand Forks would need to go back and maybe remove this project from the original six listed, because this is the only one that is inside our study area that needs to be included in our T.I.P., and it would prevent the County and the State from having those other five projects advance constructed in the County. He pointed out that advance construction is a federally allowed process, and it is a process that is probably judiciously used in North Dakota, liberally used in most other States, and Minnesota has a huge advance construction program.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE 2017-2020 T.I.P. AMENDMENTS, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: Malm and Mock.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY UPDATE

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

Presentation ensued.

Powers asked, if the 47th Avenue Interchange were to happen, would 32nd Avenue remain as it is. Haugen responded that it would. He explained that there would be some spot improvements that could be done, but essentially what is currently there would still be there in the future, as we wouldn't be adding another lane of through movements, we aren't adding another loop to the system, but are instead just doing some spot improvements at intersections.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 21st, 2016**

Haugen reported that ultimately what they are showing is that it makes the most sense to invest in the 47th Avenue Interchange instead of trying to improve 32nd Avenue.

Haugen summarized that the North Washington interchange has some opportunities to do some improvement but it isn't critical to the operation of the Interstate nor to the North Washington Corridor; that at Gateway Drive we have identified the Northeast Loop and we are reaffirming that it is a good solution but are also saying that a Grade Separation can't be really sought as an afterthought and needs to be thought of as part of the solution to the I-29 traffic problem; that on DeMers Avenue we are saying that a 42nd Street Underpass would make the DeMers Interchange more cost effective, more operationally effective, and allows for investment of less monies in the Interchange; that at 32nd Ave S we can't make any improvements to the existing interchange to make it work better, and that the most reasonable thing would be to put in a 47th Avenue Interchange, but there is some options as to where it is located on the system, whether at the true 47th Avenue alignment or shifted south; and that at Merrifield it still makes sense to add an on/off ramp at Merrifield, but we need to identify that if one of those are added something would need to be done at the Columbia Road and Merrifield intersection as well.

Haugen stated that the next step will be to give presentations, and they are trying to make February 13th work for the Grand Forks City Council Working Session; February 21st for the Grand Forks County Commission; and a third public input meeting sometime between those dates; and then to identify the implementation staging. He said that we have a bunch of feasible projects with good costs attached to them, so we need to identify at what priority they should be attacked, and then recommend that to the MPO and the State of North Dakota.

Haugen commented that a draft and final report will be submitted in the spring.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2016 UPWP Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2016 and 2017 projects was included in the packet.

b. US#2/USBus#2 Steering Committee Meeting

Haugen reported that tomorrow morning is the kickoff meeting of the U.S. #2/U.S. Bus. #2 Study on the Minnesota side. He said that the meeting is at 10:00 in the East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room.

Haugen added that they are also trying to schedule a public input meeting on February 7th and have asked to be added to the East Grand Forks City Council Agenda that evening as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 21st, 2016**

c. Federal Highway Performance Management Rules

Haugen reported that last week Federal Highway promulgated it's final performance management rules so we now should have the processes finalized and set as to our next Long Range Transportation Plan and what are the actual required performance measures, process, what we have to measure in place, but we still have to learn a lot of the ins and outs of these requirement and work with our State, Federal and Local Partners as to what the right targets should be as we identify those measures.

Haugen commented that, as you will recall, when we talked about the work program one of the big unknowns we had going into our next two-year Long Range Transportation Plan Update was what are the rules going to be, and we can now say that we know what those rules are so next month you should see the RFP for the Street and Highway Plan Element, and it should be more concrete as to what the things that we are required to do and the timeframe we have to do them.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 18, 2017,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:05 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Tuesday, February 21st, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the February 21st, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:04 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent was: Jeannie 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.

Guests: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 18TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 18TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that there were no updates on the Sorlie Bridge Project.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that there is a very rough project timeline included. He added that a week from tomorrow there will also be an open house here in the East Grand Forks City Hall as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR NEAR SOUTHSIDE TRAFFIC STUDY

Haugen reported that this is in our work program to do at the request of the Grand Forks City Council. He referred to the packet, and pointed out that there are two components to this study: a) A.T.A.C. Scope of Work; and b) RFP for Conceptual Drawings. He explained that A.T.A.C. is our Travel Demand Modeler and the other would be a consulting firm that would do some conceptual drawings.

Haugen commented that the purpose of this study is to identify countermeasures intended to calm traffic for the Near Southside Neighborhood, as well as to provide improved safety, improved overall traffic flow, and to optimize intersection function, with consideration to all modes of transportation. He added that the City is concerned that some of the techniques the neighborhood might want to explore may cause traffic to divert to other streets within the neighborhood, and thus creating additional concerns.

Haugen stated that A.T.A.C. would be hired, under this proposal, to engage the neighborhood, and also run model scenarios that would show how doing something at one location may or may not affect another location.

Haugen commented that one thing that A.T.A.C. does not do as an organization is to provide conceptual drawings, so that is the reason for needing a second RFP, for us to hire a consultant to do more of that quasi engineering conceptualizations, particularly for intersections that might be modified.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee asked that the second RFP be issued to get the consultant on board. He explained that initially staff was looking at a different way of procuring that, but it was felt that it would be best to go through the RFP process. He added that one reason for engaging A.T.A.C. is that, assuming your approval today, they can begin right away as that neighborhood is quite a ways along in our interest to have some work done; while the RFP process will go into April before we are able to present a consultant to hire.

DeMers asked if in the scope of this study it accounts for the possibility of a southend bridge being constructed in the future. He stated that if 1/3 of the traffic is downtown destination based, a 1/3 of the traffic is locally based, and 1/3 of the traffic is potentially from the southend of East Grand Forks; if there is some kind of change to the southend bridge, depending on what location it is placed at, that could have an effect on that traffic in this area. Haugen responded that we already have the model runs as to what would happen to traffic, particularly on Belmont, if another southend bridge is built, so that would be part of this, but the real focus is on what might happen to today's traffic, if they do any traffic calming techniques.

Grasser commented that part of what we are looking for here, we have had traffic issues come up here for the last number of years, and they have been working with some neighborhood groups. He stated that the current group is a small group, and actually the techniques they are pursuing at this point in time are actually fairly innocuous, relative to shifting traffic, but what they

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Tuesday, February 21st, 2017**

discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee is that they feel that it is important to get some of those more onerous techniques that have come up in the past, that we have a record of it, because he thinks they will reoccur, and we want to be able to demonstrate through scientific model distribution what might happen to that traffic if in fact you do take some technique that significantly shifts traffic.

Vein commented that Belmont is a minor arterial so it is intended to move traffic, and the more you impede the traffic on it the more the side streets will be impacted, but the study will look at this in depth. Haugen agreed, adding that all of these are two-way, two-lane roadways that can conceivably carry up to 10,000 vehicles a day, and none of them are reaching half that amount.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE A.T.A.C. SCOPE OF WORK, AND THE RFP FOR TRAFFIC PLANNING SERVICES FOR THE NEAR SOUTHSIDE TRAFFIC STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Mock.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT OF THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Haugen reported that, again, in your work program for the next two years we will be focusing a lot of our resources on updating our Long Range Transportation Plan. He stated that this RFP deals directly with the Street/Highway Element, specifically on the automobile and truck traffic. He added that we are currently finishing up on the transit and bike/ped side of the plan.

Haugen commented that we will be hiring a consultant to assist us with the Street/Highway Element this year, and we will have until the end of 2018 to complete this portion of the Long Range Transportation Plan update. He added that we have a deadline of the end of December 2018 to adopt an updated 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan and submit it to our federal agencies for review.

Haugen stated that this RFP is drafted with a lot of the standard elements that are required for a Street/Highway Plan, but we are getting into a new stage of truly having performance based planning and programming. He said that we know that after May of 2018 any action we take, whether it is adopting a T.I.P., amending a plan, amending the T.I.P., will all have to be in conformance with the requirements of the FAST Act.

Haugen reported that there are different dates in which some performance measures have to be identified. He stated that one of the last agenda items today talks about the transit side, and that we actually have until the end of June of this year to come up with some of those performance targets. He added that on the safety side of the street/highway portion we have until the end of February 2018 to come up with performance targets; and recently one of the last things the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Tuesday, February 21st, 2017**

Obama Administration did was to publish the rules for the bridge and pavement condition, and also for the performance measures, but the Trump Administration has put them on hold for a while, but Federal Highway just released a brief last week saying that that hold has been released and an October 2018 deadline has been set for those targets to be in place.

Haugen pointed out that we have allocated a large portion of our budget resources towards this update over the two year period, and expect a \$300,000 consultant contract. He added that we also identified, assuming the RFP is approved today and released, the project schedule dates. He pointed out that it is anticipated that we will have a consultant selected for your consideration at your April meeting, then we will submit the proposal to our federal partners for their review, and a consultant can then be approved and hired in May. He added that the next date you see is September 2018. He explained that rather than try to identify all those other moving parts a head of time for the consultants, we are putting it on the consultants to propose a timeline and give us an idea of how they will progress and meet the schedule of having a complete draft by September 2018 for our review; and then we will go through the final approval stages in October, November and December 2018.

Haugen commented that we also identified that the Selection Committee for this update is the Technical Advisory Committee.

Vein asked if there would be criteria established, and would it be more subjective. Haugen referred to the RFP and pointed out that Item IV lists the RFP evaluation criteria and selection process. He added that they will ask this consultant to also work with A.T.A.C. on understanding what our Travel Demand Model forecast is informing us.

Haugen said that A.T.A.C. has been made aware of some of the things we need to update our Travel Demand Model, and they will be producing a 2030 year loaded model and a 2045, so we will also have a kind of midpoint understanding of what issues might be coming when down the road.

Grasser asked if this consultant would have any role in assisting us in meeting the different criteria that will be set up by the FAST Act. Haugen responded they would. Grasser asked for a brief description of what that role will be. Haugen responded that we will be working, obviously, with both State DOT's; and again because we are a Bi-State MPO we have the option to either adopt one target that covers our metropolitan area, or we can adopt each State's individual targets, so part of the consultants role will be helping us understand the benefits of perhaps adding that one target versus having two separate State targets for our MPO; understanding what all of the ins and outs, as best as they know, and participate as a guidance when we work with the State DOT's in establishing their targets.

Grasser commented that he is really happy to hear this because it has been a concern that he has had, that the dichotomy between the two States as to how they each interpret federal regulations because lots of people can read the same regulation and come up with different ways of complying with it, and the State of North Dakota has a pretty minimalistic interpretation of how they want to proceed, while Minnesota generally, especially if they are targeted towards the Metro-Area, interprets them quite a bit farther on the spectrum, so he is glad to hear we are going to have that discussion and get some assistance figuring out which is the best way for us to proceed as an MPO at the local level.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Tuesday, February 21st, 2017**

Haugen agreed and gave a brief overview of the differences between the two States.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT OF THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Mock.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF RFP FOR COPIER/PRINTER

Haugen reported that in our work program we did identify that we are going to explore replacing our copier/printer. He referred to the RFP, included in the packet, and explained that it was developed to help local firms be able to give us quotes on their equipment. He stated that after bids are received, staff will review then and choose a couple for demonstration.

Haugen said that once staff has determined which copier/printer best suites our needs, the winning bid will be brought back to this body for final approval. He added that we do have the option of either purchasing a machine outright, or leasing it.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR A MULTI-FUNCTION COPIER/PRINTER, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Mock.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY

Haugen referred to the packet and explained that it includes a copy of the presentation that was given at the first Steering Committee meeting. He stated that they do have an active property ownership/business interest in that committee, so we are getting some really great first hand input.

Haugen referred to a map illustrating the boundaries of the study, and went over it briefly.

Haugen reported that one thing they have found is that safety data we initially received from MnDOT was identifying that both U.S. Business #2 and 220 North intersections had an unusually high amount of crashes occurring on them, but through the help of the District Traffic Engineer, we were directed to a better data base and have found that the problem is truly just U.S. Business #2 and U.S. #2 that have a higher crash rate.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Tuesday, February 21st, 2017**

Haugen commented that what they have heard from the Business Owners in this area is that they are surprised that there is such a high level of crashes being shown at this intersection; and also that if this is such an unsafe intersection, why has it remained fairly untouched in terms of improvements over the years.

Haugen stated that MnDOT's hope is that by having this group meet and work through these issues that a solution can be found that is acceptable to everyone and is implementable because they do have a project scheduled in FY2021 to work on the westbound lane through this section of roadway. He added that it also sounds like MnDOT is willing to invest a healthy sum of money in this area to correct what is being documented with the data as a location that has an unusual crash history.

Haugen reported that the Steering Committee is planning on scheduling a meeting next week to refine alternatives that are more promising. He added that they did hold a public input meeting last week as well, with most of the input coming, again, from the property and business owners in the study area.

Strandell commented that the business owners out there, their biggest fear is that MnDOT wants to close the intersection totally, and almost anything else would be acceptable to them in terms of a solution. He added that he knows that what Polk County and MnDOT did at the Polk County 21 and Highway 75 Intersection, with the installation of flashing warning lights, is something they would prefer over anything else at this intersection as well.

Vein asked what the completion date of this study is. Haugen responded that they hope to have a final document for approval at your May meeting.

MATTER OF I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that, as you will recall, we heard the results of the micro-analysis done at your meeting last month, so he is just giving an update on what has occurred since then. He stated that staff attended the Grand Forks City Committee of the Whole meeting last week to give them a briefing on the micro-analysis level of detail. He added that they also held a public input meeting last Thursday, with mostly those interested in a Merrifield Interchange attending; and will be attending the Grand Forks County Commission meeting next.

Haugen stated that he did provide a summary of what looks like are the alternatives that are rising to the top. He said that the Steering Committee is still set to finalize these and then their next task will be to give us some idea of prioritization, what should happen before others.

Haugen referred to a slide and pointed out that it does show all of the dollar amounts for each of the alternatives, and it does add up to quite a large sum.

Haugen commented that we have gone through the analysis that shows that these aren't just wants, that they are actual needs to address traffic issues occurring today, in some cases, and what is being forecasted to occur in the future.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Tuesday, February 21st, 2017**

Haugen referred to a slide showing the project schedule, and went over it briefly. He added that it is hoped that a final document will be available in June for your consideration.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 UPWP Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

b. Transit Performance Targets

Haugen reported that all of our transit operators were required, by the end of last year, to have performance identified. He said that both State DOT's were also required to have that as well.

Haugen commented that we are members of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, and they sent him a copy of a "Dear Colleague" letter from FTA. He said that he started to ask questions as to where our transit operators, or our transit side, are on this and a lot of them were caught off guard and we are now on a 180 day clock to come up with targets.

Haugen stated that this was discussed briefly at the Technical Advisory Committee, with our State Partners, and we are still trying to get to the bottom of what is going on. He said that on the Minnesota side, their Office of Transit in St. Paul is trying to get something sent to us by the first of March, but as far as he knows FTA has not relaxed the June deadline for the MPO to have performance targets on these transit assets, so hopefully we will be able to achieve that.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 21ST,
2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:41 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, March 15th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Council Chambers**

CALL TO ORDER

KenVein, Chairman, called the March 15th, 2017, 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, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, Al Grasser, and Jeannie Mock.

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

Guests: Mike Yavarow, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 21ST, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 21ST, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that he included a copy of a handout from the MnDOT Open House that was held on the Kennedy Bridge. He added that if you drove the corridor you would have seen that the barrels are ready to be put into place.

Haugen referred to the handout and pointed out that it does list a website for updates on the project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

Haugen commented that also included in the packet was some recent correspondence that took place between Roland Young and the NDDOT concerning the Kennedy Bridge Project and other bridges in the metro area.

Sorlie Bridge

No update on the Sorlie Bridge.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2016 WORK PROGRAM ADJUSTMENT

Haugen reported that as a result of the FY2016 audit review some adjustments were required to the FY2016 Work Program. He explained that we needed to shuffle roughly \$5,700.00 between our Planning and Implementation categories and our Program Administration categories, and we require approval of that adjustment.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2016 WORK PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

Haugen commented that normally we would be approving our audit next month, however, because of the new requirement that they report on pensions, it is taking NDDPERS longer than usual to get the auditors that information, thus delaying approval of our audit.

MATTER OF U.S. #2/U.S. BUSINESS #2 STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that this is just to bring you up-to-date on the current status of the study. He commented that included in the packet were two bits of information he would like to focus on:

- 1) Impact beet harvest has on the study area.

Haugen stated that the section of U.S. #2 that we are studying is impacted by the beet harvest, and this gives you a sense of the amount of trucks moving in and out during the roughly six week harvest period. He said that American Crystal did build a new scale in this vicinity to help alleviate some of the truck stacking on US Bus 2 that had been occurring, and they have said that stacking is now a rare occurrence.

- 2) Alternatives.

Haugen reported that several alternatives have been looked at, of which the Steering Committee has chosen three for further consideration. He went over the top three alternatives briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

Alternatives 2A and 2B

Haugen stated that Alternative 2a involves adding in an acceleration lane and then separating the west-bound left turn into U.S. Business #2. He explained that by separating these out we would have improved sight distance and a lane for vehicles to get up to speed when merging into the 65+ mph traffic heading east-bound, so it does provide some substantial benefit.

Haugen commented that through our public input process we have had a lot of discussion about maybe smoothing the curve in the roadway. He referred to a diagram that shows the various options that were looked at, and went over them briefly.

Haugen referred to the middle graphic and stated that this concept is trying to replicate more of what you see near the University in Crookston, at the corner of 75. He explained that this option would allow separation, as well as a smoothing out of the super elevation impact that we currently see there, and it also provides more stacking distance.

Alternatives 3A and 3B

Haugen said that these alternatives are similar to Alternatives 2A and 2B with the exception that the former allows left outs, but the later prohibits that movement, and therefore focuses on just left-ins at the intersection. He explained that by prohibiting the left-outs, this would be the standard distance to put in a new turn to allow those that want to do a left-out to make it over to the inside lane in order to do a U-turn and go back. He added that this would also keep the acceleration lanes.

Haugen commented that Alternative 3B is just acknowledging that under 2A most vehicles would be turning at the approach into the old golf course, so it is just recognizing that movement.

Alternative 4

Haugen stated that the traffic signals, which are something that people thought should be implemented, showed they aren't warranted.

Haugen reported that all the other alternatives listed were considered, but from the Committee's standpoint, their top choice is Alternative 2B; where they smooth out the radius, try to put in more stacking availability for the vehicles going left into town, and also take away the super elevation.

Haugen stated that Alternative 2A was the second most popular choice, and Alternative 3A was the third. He said that the consultant is now taking these alternatives and refining them down to a level in which some other items can be identified; such as the Committee's desire to see some of the approach warning systems that are in place, so they can show us some diagrams as to how some of those traffic control additions to the main geometry changes can be added to the proposal.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

Haugen commented that this round of focus was on U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2; and depending on what options were being done, there was some focus on what should happen on Polk County 17 and U.S. #2, but there wasn't any real alternative that stood alone as to what should happen on U.S. #2 and Polk County 17, it was always tied to our getting something done on U.S. #2 and U.S. Business #2; so the consultant is going back to look at some ways to refine this intersection as well.

Haugen stated that one thing they were asked to look into at US 2 and Polk 17 is to try to find a way to get some distance between north-bound and south-bound lanes on U.S. #2, so that, particularly beet trucks, can stage that crossing. He said that there has been a lot of discussion from people about a considerable amount of trucks blowing through that stop sign. He added that because of the right-of-way constraints, etc., it is going to be a challenge for the consultants to get any separation between the lanes.

Haugen commented that there are also some advance traffic detection options that will also be looked at, but the thought is, just as in the option of smoothing out the curve, we take and maybe move one of the lanes forward to create that spacing.

Vein said that the thing that jumped out for him, if you are going to move that curve, and you continue and have a separation at the intersection too before you bring it back together, then you are going to combine both solutions into basically one, right. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that that is somewhat what is being pursued.

Haugen reported that the Steering Committee will be meeting the first week of April and will consider the refined top three alternatives, as well as alternatives that focus on County Road 17 and U.S. #2.

Vein asked if the intent today was to get feedback from this body, or is it just to inform us of where the study is at. Haugen responded that they would certainly accept feedback.

Haugen commented that MnDOT is going to be doing a pavement project on the west-bound lane of U.S. #2 in 2021, and it is their hope that we can come up with a solution so that it can be done at the same time.

Vein asked what the timeline is for this study. Haugen responded that it is possible that at your April meeting there may be a draft recommendation for your consideration, but certainly there will be one for your May meeting. He stated that the Steering Committee will be meeting early in April, and this body will be meeting at your more typical third week of the month, so that allows time for public involvement as well.

Haugen said that the Steering Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee, and the City Council will all be making recommendations to this body; after which the board will make the best decision based on those recommendations and will submit that decision to MnDOT, who will then determine if they are going to tie a safety project together with their pavement preservation project. He added that their decision will be based on a financial range of choices as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

DeMers commented that he really appreciates all the work that was put into this; and while he tends to agree that 2A seems to be probably the most fiscally responsible, it maybe isn't the most elegant; while 5 may be the most elegant, as he thinks roundabouts work well, he wants to make sure that we are aware that County Road 17 is going to be, at some point in time that intersection will be as important, if not more important than the Business Highway 2 intersection. He explained that he feels this way because there has been a lot of development, and it lends itself better to access management, structures; and he knows that Lumber Mart will fight it, but if you can straighten Business Highway 2 turn into County Road 17, he thinks you would see more of the harvest trucks use it rather than go all the way to Business Highway 2 and back around. He stated that if we can make that corridor a little better for Transystems and harvest trucks he thinks it would be the way to go, so certainly the alternatives presented give us a lot, but we need to make sure that we are cognizant of it, as well as future development, that property that is just south of County Road 17 had a lot of potential, and hopefully if we manage that access right it will be good to help promote business and development.

Powers stated that one thing that was brought up, and Mr. Strandell was there as well, is that we don't want to take the problem that we have with Business 2 and push it north, we have to address both problems simultaneously. Haugen pointed out that, while the nuances of funding that improvement at Polk County 17 and U.S. #2 is there, statistically it does not have crash issues.

Strandell said that his preference would be either Alternative 2A or 2B, but in conjunction with warning lights like those at County Road 21 and Highway 75, as they have been highly successful and gets ones attention, which is a lot of accident prevention. He added that this would also be the cheapest route to take, and the most effective as well.

MATTER OF I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY UPDATE

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that highlighted is a paragraph that discusses some miscommunication we may or may not be having on 32nd Avenue and the timing of its level of service. He distributed copies of a diagram illustrating the different level of service numbers for 32nd Avenue.

Haugen commented that when they wrote the staff report they thought that the question of when 32nd Avenue degrades, and what type of improvements are necessary was answered, but it is actually still being questioned. He said that the reason for the question is what is highlighted; it is from the macro-level analysis that was done. He added that, if you recall, many months ago we looked at the big project and what the impacts are on the network were; and the map on the left shows 2025 forecasted traffic volumes, with a 47th Avenue Interchange, and there are three numbers shown in each box with the top number being the existing 2015 traffic volumes, the middle number is projected 2025 traffic volumes, and the bottom number is projected 2040 traffic volumes.

Haugen said that on the left side he highlighted the 2025 forecasted volumes without a 47th Avenue Interchange, and you will notice they are roughly 13,600 and 24,900. He pointed out

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

that when you look at the 2040 traffic volumes, with the 47th Avenue Interchange, we find that there are similar ADTs forecasted. He added that in the micro-level analysis, we say that if we build a 47th Avenue Interchange, 32nd Avenue would only need minor adjustments to its current configuration, with less than a million dollar investment, and it will operate effectively. He stated that the volumes on the right side are slightly higher than the volumes forecasted in 2025 without 47th Avenue, yet the volumes in 2025 had a macro-level analysis say that the interchange can't operate under its current configuration acceptably.

Haugen stated that we go from a macro-level analysis that tells us that by 2025 32nd Avenue, with these volumes highlighted cannot provide an acceptable level of service; but at the micro-level analysis slightly higher volumes are being shown, yet we can operate at an acceptable level with a little investment.

Haugen said that we are trying to nail down, for everyone's confidence, the right analysis level to consider to determine when 32nd Avenue will start having an unacceptable level of service through the interchange area.

Haugen referred back to the miscommunication issue, and commented that throughout most of the presentations we have had on this, the presentation was really focusing on 32nd Avenue having a failing level of service closer to the 2040 timeframe.

Haugen reported that when the Implementation Plan Draft was presented, the message was different, it was that 32nd Avenue would start failing before 2025. He said that we had a long discussion about this at the Technical Advisory Committee, and it is a very fundamental question of this interstate study; when does the 32nd Avenue Interchange start to experience failing level of services, and so we are asking the consultant to prepare a document that sort of allows us to look at this graphic and try to understand why one side of these volumes doesn't allow an acceptable level of service at the current configuration of the interchange, while the other side, micro-analysis, does. He stated that this will help us get to an understanding of when the timing of 32nd Avenue may or may not be, whether it is before 2025 or later, it will help the implementation plan understand sort of the urgency of improvements at the different locations.

Haugen commented that they talked about trying to figure out how far back the first full access should be off of the interchanges, particularly when building new interchanges, and we have basically agricultural land to work with, we can probably design or plan appropriately and present better traffic flow than what we are working from if you take 32nd Avenue, for example, where we have access points that are very close to the interchange ramps, so our consultant has looked at a couple of different types of documents; the one on the left addresses more of what would be considered more of a rural setting and spacing for access, and the one on the right would be in a very constrained urban area, and you can see there is a big difference between the distance between the ramps and the first full access point. He said that how this translates into 47th Avenue, just assuming that the interchange is built, and built at the 47th Avenue alignment and not shifted south, you can see that going with the most extreme access pushes it partially past the 34th Street extension. He stated that if you go with the more constrained option, you will see that 38th Street flows a little bit better.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

Haugen reported that the Steering Committee, with direction from the State DOT, is drafting language that talks about trying to get this distance for the first full access to line up closer to where 34th would be, but also recognizing that there is opportunity for access points between the first full one and the ramps themselves; so, for example potentially 38th could access 47th Avenue possibly as a three quarter access.

Strandell asked if Merrifield is done and gone now. Haugen responded that the Draft Implementation Plan still identifies it as a project to implement, it is just suggesting that there are other projects along I-29 that are of a higher need to be addressed, so Merrifield is being pushed to a later stage of the plan. Strandell asked how many miles there were between 47th and Merrifield. Haugen responded that there are two miles between 47th and Merrifield and one mile between 32nd and 47th, and that was part of their earlier discussions and why you see alternatives for 47th being shifted south. Vein asked if this was because of the campground there. Haugen responded that that is one of the principle considerations for the shift of 47th south, but there are possibilities of other considerations as to why it shifted; if you were trying to reconfigure how this land might or might not be developed, based on a full access being allowed close to the intersections, so you might shift the interchange down to allow for some alignment or realignment of proposed roadways to make 38th maybe the more predominant roadway.

Strandell commented that he just wants to note that Merrifield addresses beet truck traffic, 47th does not. Haugen responded that most of the beet trucks would not be allowed on the interstate because of their carrying level. He said that the interstate has somewhere around 80,000 lbs, and most of those trucks are carrying in excess of 100,000 lbs or more, so the interchange itself is not being continued to be identified as a good investment because of the beet traffic, it is being identified as a good investment because it is a more direct path for a lot of traffic to get on and off the interstate, so there would be a lot of miles and time saved.

Haugen reiterated that this is a Draft Implementation Plan, the Steering Committee has reviewed it and have provided comments on it, but it is still subject to change in the future.

Haugen said that they will ask the consultant to review the cost values they are showing. He added that another thing to remember is that we are trying to, in this document, account for the interstate improvements themselves, not for the other roadway improvements that are necessary. He cited 47th Avenue Interchange as an example in that the cost that we might be showing is just the interchange itself, while the City might be showing that 47th Avenue needs to be constructed from this point to the interchange itself, so that might be a cost that is rolled into the City estimate, but we will get that clarified so that there is no confusion as to what the numbers are representing.

Grasser commented that, just for additional clarification, the number you saw on the 42nd Street Grade Separation was \$29,000,000, and the reason that was an anomaly is because they pulled that off of an old report, but most of the rest of these are more current. He added that they shared some of their \$40,000,000 estimate, and he thinks that is what is showing up now, and when it is inflated by year of expenditure then obviously it's a larger number.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

Mock asked if the current proposal includes both 47th and Merrifield. Haugen responded that the unconstrained financial point of view, yes. He stated that in reality we have no dollars to put into any of these projects, but from a traffic operations point of view both of those would be of great benefit, and are shown to have a very high benefit cost ratio assigned to them, and they also did a cost effectiveness in this study to say that if we invested this in 2025, would there be enough benefit or use of it by 2040 to justify the cost estimate, and both of those projects came out favorable in that analysis as well, so they are great projects, but like everything else we don't have the financial resources to implement them.

Grasser commented that he thinks it is really a question of what timeframe we are looking at, this study has a certain timeline that it is looking at, and he thinks that in looking out over 40 years or something like that then he feels we are into the Merrifield. He said that to him it isn't a question if, it is a question of when, but that when takes us outside the study limits of what we are looking at here.

Haugen said that where we are at right now is that we are asking for feedback on the Draft Implementation Plan from the Steering Committee, and by the end of March KLJ will have submitted a full draft document, from the beginning to where we are now, and that will be submitted to the Steering Committee for their review and comment. He said that the importance of that is that Federal Highway is a member of the Steering Committee so we have been working with them every step of the way so hopefully there aren't any surprises when we get to the end of this project, from that point of view.

Haugen stated that during the month of April, most of the review of the draft document will be taking place; in May we have a meeting scheduled with the NDDOT Upper Management so we will have the draft document and all the comments from the Steering Committee incorporated into the presentation we will be giving Upper Management, then they will give us their official feedback on where this process is, then in June we would expect to be presenting a document to this body to finalize.

Grasser said that we talked about this at the Technical Advisory Committee, and his input is that he thinks that we should push harder for a consideration of the Urban access distance one that's on the interchange as opposed to the Rural one that puts us off half a mile. He explained that the concepts that we have already in place really set us up for the quarter mile spacing there; way back, and decisions that we made when we extended south of 32nd Avenue, if you look at 38th Street, it has multiple lanes and was envisioned to be kind of the retail corridor going south, where 34th was meant to be more of a true collector type street, and again there is the fact that we have a school there on 34th, but putting a three quarter intersection at 38th, while is operational isn't going to be conducive to making that a significant potential retail corridor, and we want to be careful about having significant amounts of traffic shifting over to 34th Street, really wasn't set up efficiently and he thinks we have more opportunity in the west side of the interstate because less things have been put into place there, so on the east side he thinks it will be a significant concern on the development side.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday March 15th, 2017**

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 UPWP Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 15TH, 2017,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:49 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, April 19th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the April 19th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

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

Guests: Jane Williams and David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 15TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 15TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

INTRODUCTIONS

Haugen commented that he forgot to introduce the MPO's new intern, Brandyn Heck at our meeting last month so he would like to take the opportunity to do so now. He stated that Brandyn is working with Ms. Kouba primarily on GIS mapping. He added that Brandyn is from Valley City and is a senior at UND in the Geography Department.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON SORLIE/KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECTS

Sorlie Bridge

Haugen reported that the information in the report isn't so much about the bridge project that we have been updating you on each month, but rather on the upcoming DeMers Avenue project whereby the NDDOT is trying to figure out if they should do a complete reconstruction or a mill and overlay.

Haugen stated that, if you recall, back during discussions on the Sorlie Bridge project there was talk about doing some repair work to the approach spans and both NDDOT and MnDOT did a temporary repair to their approaches with an agreement that they would both look at a more permanent fix when North Dakota does work on their side of DeMers. He said, then, that included in the packet is information concerning NDDOT beginning discussion on their approach to figuring out how to do the DeMers Avenue project, their segment of US Business 2 loop.

Haugen commented that the NDDOT Headquarter staff met last week, however some of the information they can't share just yet, but in the staff report he does mention that there is a whole host of other questions and things they would like to get input from the MPO on. He said that staff will have that prepared and vetted through the Technical Advisory Committee for the next MPO Executive Policy Board meeting in May, but he did want to make note that one of the main comments he made to them was a reminder that they had agreed to address the approach issue further, so hopefully it is back on the forefront, so when they consider what to do on DeMers they also focus a little on the approach, and also engage MnDOT on their approach span as well.

Kennedy Bridge

Haugen reported that, he is sure you are aware of the lane shift that is taking place currently on the Kennedy. He stated that the project schedule is on the website: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/d2/projects/kennedybridge/index.html>, but if you would like to sign up for direct e-mail notifications you can do so here as well.

Strandell commented that he hopes there isn't an overlap between the Kennedy project and the Sorlie, as far as traffic movement. Haugen responded that there shouldn't be. He added that the DeMers Avenue, downtown Grand Forks, project is scheduled to occur in 2019, and all they are doing now is studying. He said that there is going to be an overlap with DeMers Avenue, west of the Fire Station out to the Interstate however.

Vein stated that they will be doing the DeMers Avenue rehabilitation from the DeMers bridge west to the Interstate this summer, and there will also be closures on the Kennedy Bridge this summer as well, so we will have some real traffic issues. He added that there seems to be more traffic on DeMers, is that true. Haugen responded that he hasn't looked into this, but there are video cameras at all the downtown signals capturing counts, so we could check to see if there is a significant difference in the amount of traffic on DeMers. Williams said that she thought about doing that, but with so many variables going on she hasn't, however it can certainly be done. Vein stated that it seems to him there is more traffic, but it could be perception versus reality.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

Vein asked, on the DeMers Avenue project, as they are looking at a mill and overlay versus reconstruction, what will the role of the MPO be in looking at what the options are, or what design needs to take place on that section of DeMers. He added that he knows there are people with bicycle interests that are interested in looking at that, and it really does impact all of the downtown so there is going to be a need to have a fair amount of input in it as the process goes forward.

Haugen responded that the first thing would be if they try to add capacity by adding through lanes in that project, that would be inconsistent with all of our planning efforts, so we would have to work through that inconsistency. He added that in recognizing that we have capacity issues and that there are three existing river crossings, the communities' solution to that has always been to add a fourth bridge somewhere, so adding capacity downtown would be against what we have been planning.

Haugen stated that this also causes a sort of difficult decision, in that if they do a mill and overlay, then they really are just doing a pavement preservation project that they don't necessarily have to address capacity issues; but if they do a reconstruction project then the initial point of view, from a federal perspective, would be that they would have to address all of the known issues that exist on the corridor.

Haugen commented that beyond the capacity issue, we would have plans that identify whether or not there are bike facilities on the street identified or not, and there currently are none; or for other facilities identified in any of our plans on DeMers Avenue through the downtown. He added that we have done parking studies, so the parking does not suggest any changes to the parking stalls, and if they are parallel they are recommended to remain parallel and not convert to diagonal or be removed, so it is kind of being consistent with our planning documents, and if they are consistent then we are okay.

Vein said that he is talking about, maybe in terms of jurisdictional, when does City Planning, City Council take on the features that will be part of the project; and where does the MPO come in. Haugen responded that, again, we have adopted plans that they need to be consistent with; we have some of the downtown plans that identified some design opportunities for consideration, and when they go through project development they need to be consistent with those plans. He added that if they aren't going to be consistent with our plans, it means we will need to work out that inconsistency prior to federal highways signing off on the project.

Vein asked who has authority over what, does the MPO have authority or someone else. He explained that he knows the people have a lot of thoughts on this, how is it all incorporated into determining the final solutions. Haugen responded that the ultimate authority the MPO has is that we will have to program the dollars to the project. He stated that so far we have programmed what has been deemed "the reconstruction" estimate, but if they don't want to do the project at that price, we will have to make a decision as to whether or not we will change the amount in the T.I.P. Vein said, then, that it comes down to the dollars and the consistency with our plans.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

Grasser commented that City staff has been working pretty extensively with the DOT relative to public input, and he knows they have been contacting the different interests group downtown, so at some point we are going to get, probably, a number of competing views as to what the street section should look like, so that will end up coming back to City Council at some point in time, and eventually we will have to approve a project concept report at the local level.

Grasser stated that some of the decisions the City Council would make kind of had actually happened because we had a discussion a couple of years ago about whether to program it as an overlay or a reconstruction, and the decision was to, at least for programming purposes, to put reconstruction dollars in the T.I.P. He added that there will be some additional decision points, but he envisions council will be very involved.

Grasser commented that they did talk to the DOT about hiring a consultant to lead the process, but they determined that they wanted to do it in-house, and so that ball is just beginning to roll. He said that, relative to construction time, he isn't even sure, maybe Mr. Haugen has more detail, but there is always a disconnect between; we call this a 2019 project but is it going to be constructed in 2019 or is it 2019 dollars being used in 2020, because in his mind he isn't sure they are going to be able to pull this off for a 2019 construction season, he actually sees a 50/50 chance it will be a 2020 actual construction. Haugen responded that what is in the staff report is the schedule that they provided, and they are saying it will be a 2019 construction.

Discussion on construction issues/challenges ensued.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF COPIER/PRINTER PURCHASE

Haugen reported that we received three bids on the copier/printer, however one did not meet specs and was rejected, and the other was unable to offer a demonstration within our timeline, which left us with only one option, which, luckily was the best of the three in terms of meeting the specs and also the pricing.

Haugen stated that we did ask for both a leasing option as well as a purchase option, and the purchase option makes the best fiscal sense. He pointed out that we also show a comparison of what our current monthly charges are for our existing copier/printer versus what the monthly charges will be for our new copier/printer, and it will be less expensive as well.

Haugen said that, with this information, staff is recommending the MPO Executive Policy Board approve authorizing the purchase a copier/printer from Liberty Business Systems, as presented.

Powers asked where Liberty Business Systems is based out of. Haugen responded that they are a local firm, located on 32nd Avenue South just west of Sterling Home Center.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE PURCHASE OF A COLORED COPIER/PRINTER FROM LIBERTY BUSINESS SYSTEMS, INC.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2017 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2017-2020 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that there are amendments being proposed on both the transit side and the street/highway side.

Haugen stated that on the transit side we are introducing new funds into the service. He explained that the State of Minnesota has solicited all of their Greater Minnesota Transit Operators to submit proposals on increasing service in their community and the City of East Grand Forks proposed introducing night bus service to East Grand Forks. He said that, if you didn't already know, night service for both fixed-route and Dial-A-Ride were only available in Grand Forks, but East Grand Forks is now seeking the state funding to introduce that service to East Grand Forks as well. He commented that, additionally, there were funds available to purchase capital equipment, so East Grand Forks also applied for a vehicle.

Haugen said that these services will be 100% funded by the State of Minnesota for a two year period. He explained, however, that after the two year period, assuming the service is doing well, East Grand Forks will most likely need to cover the 20% local share of those costs.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet is a copy of the award letter identifying the amounts, and then in the project listings we have identified how the services will be provided.

Haugen explained that the State S.T.I.P. is technically on a State Fiscal Year, which is July 1st to June 30th; whereas the MPO T.I.P. has traditionally been on the Federal Fiscal Year, which is October 1st to September 30th. He said that these funds are available July 1st of 2017, so in order to cover all possible bases we are amending our 2017 T.I.P. so that for the next three to four months of 2017 East Grand Forks has the ability to access these funds, so that is why we showing it in 2017 even though the award letter is identifying 2018.

Haugen commented that East Grand Forks Transit is also proposing a change to have a current project to purchase a demand response vehicle. He said that in talking with Grand Forks Transit, they are now proposing to instead purchase some IT and security equipment with the East Grand Forks regular 5307 funds, so that change is also being noted on the transit side.

Haugen stated that on the street/highway side, East Grand Forks gets City Sub-target funding from MNDOT every four years, and 2018 is the year it is next available. He said that previously it was identified that they would use the monies to construct a round-about down on Bygland and Rhinehart Drive, but it is now felt that they may not be able to deliver that project in 2018 so they have been working with MPO and MnDOT staff to see what could be done, and the solution is to substitute projects that are more easily implementable in 2018.

Haugen commented that they are amending out the round-about and instead using their 2022 funds to construct it; and then in 2018 they will do five mini projects instead. He went over the five projects briefly:

- 1) Multi-use trail along the west median between MN 220 N and the frontage road. It is an 8- trail located between US 2 and 17th Street N.W.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

- 2) Greenway Boulevard reconstruction and sidewalk improvements involving modifications to the center median to improve access and to construct a sidewalk from Bygland Road and Rhinehart Drive.
- 3) At the intersection of Bygland Road and 13th Street S.E. improve the pedestrian crossing treatments to enhance the safety of pedestrians crossing at this intersection.
- 4) Rhinehart Drive reconstruction between just south of Bygland Road (avoiding the footprint of the round-about) to 6th Street S.E.
- 5) Mill and overlay the asphalt segment of 1st Avenue S.E. adjacent to the Point Bridge.

Haugen stated that these projects are all showing up in your T.I.P. listings in FY2018. He said that a public hearing was advertised, but no written or verbal comments were received. He added that East Grand Forks is showing for their street projects that there is no local match as they are identifying that they will be using their Municipal State Aid account to provide the match for the federal funds for these projects. He said, however, that this does not mean that they cannot use local dollars for match.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY2017 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2017-2020 T.I.P., AND THE FY2018 PROJECT LISTING, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF ND FTA 5310 & 5339 CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that back in February both the MPO and the NDDOT solicited for projects for their FTA 5339 and 5310 programs. She said that the MPO deadline for submittals was April 1st in order for us to get them to the NDDOT by May 1st. She stated that the Cities Area Transit was the only entity to submit projects for both funding sources.

Kouba referred to the staff report and went over the projects for both the 5339 and the 5310 programs:

5339 Projects

- 1) Fare Media Encoding “PEM” Machines – Requesting \$30,400
- 2) Facility Rehabilitation (Bus Barn and Administration Building Renovations, and update HVAC system) – Requesting \$309,600

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

- 3) Mobile Video Camera System – Requesting \$48,000
- 4) Maintenance Software – Requesting \$80,000

5310 Projects

- 1) Mobility Manager – Requesting \$74,345
- 2) Replacing ADA Minivan – Requesting \$30,400
- 3) Replacing ADA Minivan – Requesting \$54,800

Kouba reported that staff is recommending approval of the Candidate Projects in the order given.

MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE ND FTA 5339 AND 5310 GRANTS IN THE PRIORITY ORDER GIVEN.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT WITH KIMLEY-HORN/WSB FOR STREET AND HIGHWAY PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that back in March you authorized the release of the RFP for updating our Street and Highway Element for the Year 2045. He said that March 31st was the deadline and four proposals were submitted.

Haugen commented that there was a selection committee identified that you approved, and that selection committee was the actual Technical Advisory Committee. He said that they met and reviewed all four proposals last Tuesday, and through the selection process they recommended Kimley Horn/WSB as their top choice.

Haugen stated that when they opened their cost estimate it was, based on their written and oral presentation, \$288,000 and change, and we budgeted \$300,000 for the project. He added that they also identified in their proposal some optional public engagement techniques, and the selection committee recommended that the MPO look into them and see what the true cost of doing them, and what they really entail, would be.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that he identified that we would be trying to work with Kimley Horn on the contract negotiations, adding, however, that when he wrote the staff report he didn't realize what impact the Easter Holiday would have on everybody's work schedule. He said, though, that from a staff perspective we think we have, after negotiating with Kimley Horn, a doable contract and scope of work.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

Haugen commented that the three optional items were:

- 1) On-line Mapping Tool – this would be a way for the general public to be directed to an on-line map of Grand Forks/East Grand Forks that they can comment and write what their traffic issue is at both locations. He said that we can use this tool as we look at alternatives to show them where these alternatives are and get their feedback directly on the on-line system. He added that this is a tool the MnDOT is used in their recent planning documents statewide.
- 2) Pop-up Events – this would be similar to those events that we held when we did the Grand Forks Land Use Plan. He said that this is where we went out to public events and tried to engage citizens, the French fry feed was one example. He stated that they were proposing to add three of these. He added that as we were negotiating with them a sub-set of this would be what is called a “meeting in a box” whereby instead of then staffing these pop-up events they would get all the materials ready and MPO staff would then use it to hold the event ourselves.
- 3) Project Fact Sheets – whereby when we get down to the final list of projects that might have serious consideration of being in the fiscally constrained plan, they would prepare fact sheets, one pagers, that would try to inform everyone as to what that project is, what it is trying to accomplish, what the cost is, etc.

Haugen reported that after talking to Kimley Horn the only one that staff is recommending be done is the on-line mapping tool. He added that the total negotiated cost, including this tool, is \$285,000.

Grasser stated that he wanted to thank Mr. Haugen for following up on this. He explained that he had voiced some concern at the Technical Advisory Committee about the \$300,000 budget, and their original proposal of \$288,000, and not having anything left to work with in the event there would be some change orders for some additional things that might come up, so he is glad to see the lower cost so we have some dollars left to work with.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT TO RETAIN KIMLEY-HORN/WSB FOR UPDATING THE STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT OF THE 2045 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE FY2018-2021 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that typically in the spring we are adopting a Draft T.I.P. for consideration of our next four years, and off and on the last several years we have been able to do a dual Minnesota/North Dakota T.I.P., while at times we have been doing one side only. He added that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

in April we have never not done a Draft Minnesota side T.I.P., and this year we are once again doing only the Draft Minnesota side T.I.P. for the next four years.

Haugen stated that this draft assumed that the 2018 swapping of East Grand Forks projects would be approved, so they are listed in this draft document.

Haugen commented that because of how funding revenues come into the Minnesota side of our study area, beside the transit project we already talked about, and the swapping of projects in 2018; there isn't a lot of other projects listed in this document.

Haugen referred to the FY2019 project list, and explained that the reason he left it blank is because of the whole thing we talked about with the transit and the state fiscal and federal fiscal years. He said that this is the draft of the next T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle, and between now and August, when we do the final document, there might be some reasons why we have to shift some of those state funded transit projects to be shown in FY2019, and this draft is showing them as 2017/2018 projects, so he wanted to have placeholders in 2019 in the event we do have to move some of those state funded projects into 2019.

Haugen commented that there are three new projects in the last year of the T.I.P.; there are the regular transit operating ones, and then the three new ones:

- 1) Pavement surface project on the westbound lane of U.S. #2 from Fisher to 5th Avenue N.E. in East Grand Forks.
- 2) Construct a safe routes to school sidewalk from 19th Avenue S.E. and along 13th Street S.E. to connect to school.
- 3) Safe Routes to School educational and encouragement funding for a three year period.

Haugen said that each document needs to show where things are with the current projects, shown in Appendix I, Project Status, and the big one is the Kennedy Bridge, and we all know that that is under construction.

Haugen stated that, with the one change to show the new final amount of the U.S. #2 project, staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of the Draft Minnesota Side T.I.P. For FY2018-2021.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT
MINNESOTA SIDE FY2018-2021 T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.***

DeMers asked, on the new projects we just amended, the cost of those are listed in the "Other" column not "Local", why is that. Haugen responded that it is because since it isn't true East Grand Forks money, it is State Aid, so they want it listed as "Other", and then in the remark section we identify "Other" as Municipal State Aid. He added that you see this with transit as well. He explained that from MnDOT's point of view the State column or cell is only related to trunk highway funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, DeMers, Strandell, Malm, Vein, Grasser, and Mock.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstaining: None.
Absent: None.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT TO COMPLETE NEAR SOUTHSIDE
NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPT DRAWINGS**

Haugen reported that, again, back in February you authorized the release of an RFP to do the conceptual drawings for the Near Southside Neighborhood study. He stated that A.T.A.C. is doing most of the work, however, as we informed you then, they were not overly interested in doing some of these conceptual drawings, so we released an RFP. He said that March 31st was the deadline for submittal of proposals, but we received no responses. He explained that he thinks the primary reason for our getting no proposals was because there is only a \$10,000 budget and most firms felt that that would be spending close to that amount in preparing a proposal and possibly having to be interviewed, thus we received zero responses.

Haugen stated that we then worked with the NDDOT to determine where we go from here, and the next step is, since we did go through the formal RFP process and got zero responses, was to go to the non-competitive based negotiation process, which is essentially to just ask for quotes. He said that he sent out a request for quotes, hoping to get three responses, to fifteen firms that were pre-qualified by the NDDOT to do this type of work. He stated that the proposals were due on Monday, and we did receive one from CPS.

Haugen reported that the CPS quote met the scope of work that we identified in the request for quotes, which was simply taking our RFP and using the same basic work we are asking for with the exception of elimination of some of the proposal work and some of the interviewing process to allow for us to just get quotes. He stated that because we only received one quote we did need to discuss it with the NDDOT to get their approval, and their answer was that if it was responsive to our request then we could go forward with an agreement with CPS to do the drawings.

Haugen stated that the proposal has been shared with the City Engineering and Planning staff, who were identified as the people who would be making the selection. He said that he has not yet heard back from engineering, but the planning staff felt comfortable with what is being proposed.

Haugen commented that we had a \$10,000 budget for the consultant work, and their quote is for \$10,000, so as it stand right now we have one firm that has provided a quote, it is at our budgeted amount to do the work, and it seems like they are proposing to do the work we are asking for in the RFP/RFQ, so staff is recommending approval.

Grasser asked the engineering staff present if they felt comfortable with this proposal. Kuharenko responded that he reviewed the proposal and he has no comments on it. Vein stated that it sounds like the proposal is satisfactory.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE CONTRACT WITH CPS, LTD., TO COMPLETE THE NEAR SOUTHSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPT DRAWINGS.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT WITH A.T.A.C. TO INCLUDE A SPEED STUDY AND WALKABILITY ASSESSMENT FOR THE NEAR SOUTHSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD

Haugen reported that we are starting to collect traffic data, and we have met with some of the members of the Neighborhood Task Force that they formed, and one of the things they asked us to consider is to do a speed study. He stated that the City did a speed study with a police trailer, and the neighborhood felt that it influenced the speed of vehicles, so A.T.A.C. has equipment available, and they are willing to put it out on a pole, which makes it less noticeable than a trailer being in a parking area. He said that they are proposing to do four spot speed studies, which would cover Reeves Drive, Belmont, Cherry and 4th Avenue, those four corridors, and the cost would be \$3,800.

Haugen commented that they also talked about what is truly “walkability”. He said that they would like to have a training session whereby the neighborhood and others would go through a session of defining what walkability is, and then going out and doing an audit. He stated that this would cost an additional \$2,000.

Haugen said that staff is asking for approval to amend our current A.T.A.C. contract to add these two items, at a cost of roughly \$5,800. He commented that we do have a technical assistance activity in our work program to cover this additional cost.

Grasser commented that he struggles with the walkability portion because it is going to be very subjective, and we know that our system isn’t perfect, and a lot of the reason it isn’t perfect is because we have planning constraints, we have other constraints, and he struggles with how much time should we spend and how much money should we spend getting input from a small specific group identifying a bunch of wishes and then struggle with being able to fund them. He added that, philosophically it is a bit of a struggle he has sometimes with when we do the planning and we don’t have any financial or other constraints to the system, we are just asking people what they want, and, again, presuming that essentially what we are going to get out of this is another list of things a specific neighborhood wants in their particular area, so he isn’t objecting to it necessarily, but he struggles with not having a financial piece to the question.

Haugen responded that they were viewing this as trying to get a foundation as to what is walkability, so that there is a bit of a common base component and then use that as a way to assess the neighborhood so that we don’t get someone on Reeves Drive feeling that pristine

sidewalks and what have you is walkability versus a different point of view from someone on Belmont or Cherry, to have a commonality as to what is truly a good walkability system in place,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

and then be able to go out and use that to assess the neighborhood; to give us a base understanding of what the components of walkability are.

Vein said that the original scope was to do a traffic study correct. Haugen responded that that is correct, but it did include looking at the pedestrian and bicycle modes in addition to vehicle traffic. He said that there was some work done with the Near Southside Neighborhood Association a couple of year ago that did assess the sidewalk conditions, and such, and those were done without this agreement as to what are the components of walkability, they were more of that subjective type of review and comment, so as we have the data that we are looking at we are trying to get to a commonality agreement as to what are the true components of try walkability.

Vein asked if we have walkability in any other neighborhoods. Haugen responded that we have never gone through this process where we have engaged a neighborhood to do this assessment on their neighborhood. Vein asked if we have done a walkability assessment to other neighborhoods ourselves. Haugen responded that we have not done it the way this is being set up to be done, but we have done a lot of curb ramp studies to make sure they are ADA compliant, and some projects, particularly with those with federal funding, if it is a reconstruction project we need to do an assessment on the accessibility of the whole sidewalk system through that corridor, but we have not done this. He added, though that the Near Northside Neighborhood did have a component of this, and they did fix up a lot of their sidewalks and did some curb ramps in their neighborhood.

Mock asked if we did the walkability study, and you actually define what it is, could it be something that would be carried over into other neighborhoods; because the level of engagement in this neighborhood is beyond the norm, they are very very engaged, so there is a great deal of interest, but it would be nice if you could actually define it so that we can get away from personal preferences and then it can be carried over into other neighborhoods.

Vein commented that he would think that sidewalks themselves are special assessed and would be put on a list, but curb ramps would have to be a city expense if you are doing it from the curb up to the property. Grasser agreed, adding that some of this goes back to the budget, can we afford to do what a particular neighborhood might want to do because right now our program is to do curb ramps but there is a very limited budget, so again, if you find out that there are thirty of them that this neighborhood wants you would be spending the entire one to two years of this budget in that neighborhood, which is why he is going back to the component of not having a fiscal tie to this.

Grasser asked what is the training portion, how do they train people to walk the neighborhood and assess walkability. Haugen responded that the training is getting to that commonality as to what is the walkability components that we want to assess, and then with that training the volunteers would go out and walk their neighborhood and fill out forms to give us back an assessment of what are the common definitions of what makes their neighborhood walkable.

Malm commented that he walked this area for the City a few years ago, and nothing has ever been done. He stated that the neighborhood residents are very sincere in what they believe, but

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

they are out of site on what some of these things are going to cost, and he doesn't think that anyone will every really agree on what is "walkability". He asked who will do the walking because if you use people from the neighborhood, they aren't neutral, they have a very vested interest. Haugen responded that it is through the active neighborhood group that would volunteer to do it, and there are already people volunteering to do it if we can pursue this contract amendment. Malm stated that they are probably not the right people to do it, because they have a vested interest. Haugen said that that is part of the purpose for getting the training to them so they all have a common understanding of what it is we are trying to describe as "walkability", and so that it is a more, as much as possible, objective review of what is out there. He added that they wouldn't just be sent out by themselves, we would pair them up with staff that would volunteer to walk with them to help them assess it so it isn't just letting them run amuck through the neighborhood and coming up with concepts.

Vein commented that he thinks the theory sounds good, it is just the implementation and how practical the issue is is what he is hearing.

Grasser reported that, as it is stated here, he would not be for the amendment; having said that if you add a component to the training and the discussion that says "how much am I, as an owner in the neighborhood, willing to pay to make this walkable", however they define that; \$0-\$1,000, \$1,000-\$5,000, \$5,000-\$10,000, whatever the dollar amounts might be, but to him that is the disconnect because what I want, if I don't have a financial component to it, has essentially no limit, but if you have a financial connection to it then we engage not only the idea of what is walkable, but how much maybe they are willing to contribute to get to that walkability.

DeMers commented that when he thinks about walkability he thinks of two things; 1) what distances are people walking, as this will determine whether it is not walkable, and 2) whether or not accessibility is an issue. He said that it sounds like it isn't necessarily walkability but maybe more conditions, are you talking about the condition of the sidewalks, because to him you shouldn't have to train people to do that, it is part of the complaint process, so it seems like it is two people talking about different things.

Williams stated that there is a technical definition for walkability, and it also includes an analysis of the land use and patterns and such, and a big part of the scoring for walkability is how far away is the grocery store, how far away is the library, and those kinds of things; so she totally agrees that the terminology, walkability already has an established definition of it.

Vein said that what he is hearing is that this is to help conduct a walkability study, and the consultant would still do the walkability study, correct. Haugen responded that staff goes out with them, but a lot of the people filling out the forms are volunteers. He added that if we can we can split this request and come back next month with a better information package on the walkability concept for you to consider.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONTRACT WITH A.T.A.C. TO DO JUST THE SPEED STUDY PORTION FOR THE NEAR SOUTHSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD, AND TO TABLE THE WALKABILITY PORTION OF THE STUDY TO THE NEXT MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MEETING FOR FURTHER REVIEW.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, DeMers, Strandell, Malm, Vein, Grasser, and Mock.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstaining: None.
Absent: None.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND
TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT**

Kouba reported that we are at the end of the Transit Development Plan study, and have a draft plan available for review on the website shown in the staff report.

Kouba 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.

Kouba summarized by stating that the main focus is:

- 1) Route structure
- 2) Making sure we have our performance targets
- 3) Financial outlook

Kouba stated that we have a lot going on and a lot to offer for transit, unfortunately we really need to start looking at more and more revenue sources as we aren't going to be getting the funding from the feds in the future.

Vein commented that he thinks the last item will be a huge item when it comes to cost for all of this, as we try to figure out what we can continue to afford to do. Kouba agreed.

Haugen stated that we are asking for preliminary approval of this as it sets the stage for us to be able to formally ask each city to consider the plan recommendations, and engage the public in the formal approval process. He added that that is why we are asking for preliminary approval so we can officially submit it to the cities for their consideration.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL
OF THE DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AS PRESENTED.***

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, DeMers, Strandell, Malm, Vein, and Mock.
Voting Nay: None.
Abstaining: None.
Absent: None.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2017 UPWP Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday April 19th, 2017**

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 19TH, 2017,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:30 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, May 17th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the May 17th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

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

Guests: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 19TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 19TH, 2017,
MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE N.D. CPG DISTRIBUTION FORMULA

Haugen reported that for the last three-plus years the NDDOT/FHWA-ND has been concerned about the amount of consolidated planning grants that are on the books, so they have taken some steps to try to deal with the issue; however, there is still a balance that they are trying to resolve so they have asked all three MPOs to take a look at how we might be able to come to an agreement on an approach to ensure that the balance gets spent down and doesn't build up again.

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

Haugen explained that, just as a refresher, when we talk about consolidated planning grants, they are the federal funds that we get to operate. He added that discussion of consolidated planning grants from this point on will be just those affecting the North Dakota funds, although both Fargo and us do get some Minnesota federal funds, but all the numbers you see from this point forward are just the North Dakota dollars.

Haugen commented that, as part of the federal act, they give a minimum guarantee regardless of population of the state or the size of the state; so because North Dakota is a minimum guarantee state it allows us to have a fairly healthy MPO Planning Work Program.

Haugen referred to a slide, showing our current formula, and explained that we are currently using 2016 federal dollars, a total of about \$2.5 million. He said that each MPO is given a base amount of \$120,000, and then the remainder is distributed by the percent of population; which for 2016 calculated to be \$557,379.08 for us. He added that in 2017 we did not have any additional FTA funds so the amount we are to receive is a little less at \$454,421.04.

Haugen reported that even though NDDOT and FHWA de-obligated 2014 monies, some of the MPOs still have large balances sitting on their books. He stated that, to their credit, the other two MPOs have really ramped up their consulting contracts; in fact Fargo is to the point where they have about \$1 million dollars of either existing contracts, or soon to be contracts, approved.

Haugen commented that NDDOT and FHWA don't want to open up the 2017 Grant until some of the old dollars are exhausted and off the books; which leaves the GF/EGF MPO; since we don't have that backlog of dollars, unable to access the money that is supposed to be available to us in 2017, and this is why the formula issue has been put back on the table.

Haugen stated that as a short term solution to the problem, the NDDOT is allowing the GF/EGF MPO to use the 2014 de-obligated funds; which will give us about \$330,000 to use for the next several months to pay our bills, but as we still can't touch our 2017 dollars, it is just an interim solution that the NDDOT is providing to bridge the situation, but, again what the NDDOT and FHWA really want is a change in the formula.

Haugen reported that for the past several years we have discussed the possibility of making a change to the formula because over the last six years we have received \$300,000 from each of the other MPOs. He said that if you averaged that out, it would be about \$100,000 a year that they have had to gift us so that those funds can be spent in a timely fashion.

Haugen stated that the way the proposed formula change would work would be instead of the GF/EGF MPO receiving a \$120,000 base amount, it would double that to \$240,000, while keeping the \$120,000 base amount for the other two MPOs, and then distributing the remaining monies using the same percentage based formula. He pointed out that this would equate out to just shy of a \$100,000 increase for us.

Haugen said that Bismarck/Mandan is not thrilled with this proposal, and did provide the issues shown as their reasoning. He pointed out that in the staff report he also identified that Fargo/Moorhead also had similar issues, but there is an update to this that he will explain later.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

Haugen explained that what Bismarck/Mandan is saying is that there are still too many unknowns into the future so in their opinion they don't feel there is a need to change the formula, and are suggesting that if the NDDOT and FHWA can give us these de-obligated funds for the short-term, then they can give us the de-obligated funds for a longer period of time if there is a need to do so.

Haugen commented that Fargo/Moorhead staff initially suggested this same proposal to their Technical Committee. He said that last Wednesday their Technical Committee met and they did not forward that proposal to their FM Board, which meets tomorrow, but instead they proposed three different options to consider:

- 1) Raise everyone's base allowance to \$400,000; the only MPO that shows a loss is Fargo/Moorhead, and for us would mean an increase of about \$15,000 more than what we proposed several years ago.
- 2) Use the lowest MPO budget as a base, and once that is deducted everyone gets that base and then what is left is distributed. They use the word "operations" and what that is is staff salaries, office space, office supplies, etc., not the consultant costs – this would raise the base up a bit, but again the only MPO that has their funding decreased is Fargo/Moorhead.
- 3) Make sure each MPO; regardless of whether it was the minimum or not, uses the operations budget as a base. These calculations are still unknown as they are still trying to determine what Bismarck/Mandan's base is since they are not a stand-alone entity like Fargo/Moorhead and us, they are part of the City's structure, so to get their operations budget they need to do some more reviewing.

Haugen stated that the Fargo/Moorhead Board will review these proposals. He added that there is a difference of opinion between the staff and what their Technical Committee is recommending, as staff is in favor of Bismarck/Mandan's proposal instead.

Haugen commented that just yesterday there was another proposal that the Directors from Bismarck threw out, and that is to increase the base amount to \$240,000 for all MPOs, which does help, but doesn't address the bigger issue which is that Fargo/Moorhead is still spending 2015 dollars, and even though they have ramped up their contracts to add in another million dollars, once that 2017 grant is opened they will get another million dollars that they will have to spend, and this will continue in 2018, 2019, etc., and there is a limit to what they can get under contract.

Vein asked who makes the decision. Haugen responded that the NDDOT will make the final decision. He added, though, that they are trying to allow the three MPOs to come up with a solution before stepping in. Grasser asked what the NDDOT thinks of the Bismarck/Mandan proposal. Haugen responded that it doesn't change the formula, and that is what they would like to see done. He added that from the NDDOT's perspective, they don't see how Fargo/Moorhead can spend their monies, and they don't want to continue to have so many grants open.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

Mock said that when you talk about the original formula, it seems like after the base amount the remaining monies are divided out by population percentage, which is maybe the same thing as increasing the base amount, but why wouldn't you just suggest those percentages be set using a different calculation. Haugen responded that he isn't sure what the answer to that is, but he is guessing that it is because each year the total dollars vary, so by having a base then we are sure to have a known amount and then your variation is calculated out on those percentages, so by increasing the base you lessen the percent of impact. Mock said she understands that, and the Fargo/Moorhead proposal could be one way to address this so that we are all at the same base level, but another way to address it would be to do a 33% across the board, because it looks like that is essentially what is happening over the past few years is that you have taken the excess away. Vein asked how that would impact the monies we get if we were to do this approach, because right now the one we are talking about does give us \$114,000 more a year, and he sees that as a good thing. Haugen referred to a spreadsheet and explained that by not changing the base amount, but changing the percentages instead, it would raise our amount by roughly \$230,000. Vetter commented, though, that there is a rationale with the percentage that if you have more urban area you will need more consulting, but maybe that doesn't hold true. Mock pointed out, though, that they aren't spending their funds.

DeMers stated that he would be in favor of which ever proposal gives us the most money, but, is the problem how the money is allocated or is it the constraints upon which the money can be used. He said that he doesn't know if it is a federal or state issue, or whatever, but he would imagine if there was an opening of rules or the purpose for what the monies could be spent on they would spend it more effectively. He added that if it has to be spent on just planning; and we've seen it here, it seems like sometimes you are looking at the same areas over and over again, just in different ways, so maybe if there was a way that you could still be looking at planning, but maybe transitioning into something a little more than just planning itself, that would help, so maybe the issue is not in allocation but more in how it can be better purposed to serve people's needs. Haugen responded that the two principle things behind this build-up is that Bismarck/Mandan was not willing to come up with the local match needed to spend their funds, and Fargo/Moorhead was a combination of staff turn-over and a misunderstanding of whether there were funds available for local entities to provide a match to spend the monies down; so it is not really what can be funded with these monies, but more how those two MPOs were not able to spend because of other constraints than what the federal rules would allow.

Grasser asked if locally, here, do we kind of have an unlimited local match. Haugen responded that, no we don't have an unlimited local match, but we've had a fairly consistent budget for the local match, and then those years that we got those additional funds, both entities were able to come up with their .10 cents on the dollar without much discussion or issue. Grasser asked if it is our intent that if we get any additional monies it will be spent doing studies. Haugen responded that we can't build things with these funds. Grasser said he is just wondering if we will be doing studies with consultants or are we adding staff. Haugen responded that that would be a discussion we would have to have, if we were to get these additional funds, whether we add staff or just do studies, in the past we haven't added staff, we have always added studies.

Kuharenko commented that he saw that Bismarck/Mandan had a concern of Minot becoming an MPO in 2022, is that correct. Haugen responded that they do state that concern. Kuharenko

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

said, then, that if you end up looking at an increase in your base amount, would the total amount available, because of new MPO coming in, would it be increased or would we be splitting the same sized pot between four different MPOs. Haugen responded that they would essentially be splitting it four ways instead of three, assuming that the feds don't increase the federal program substantially, but just the incremental increase that we have under FAST. Kuharenko said that this would mean we would be changing the formula now, and then possibly another five years down the road changing the formula yet again. Haugen responded that we will be changing the formula in 2022 regardless of Minot becoming an MPO or not; every ten years is a minimum that we need to consider a change to the formula.

Haugen reiterated that the NDDOT and FHWA would prefer we change the formula, and his recommendation would be to go with the recommendation the Fargo/Moorhead Technical Committee is proposing. Vein added that we would only be making a recommendation, but the NDDOT would have the final say in which proposal will be approved. Vetter stated that he is uncomfortable making a recommendation because we are the one that will get the extra monies. He said that he doesn't want Fargo/Moorhead or Bismarck/Mandan to be upset with us because we are putting forth a proposal that is going to give us all this extra money. He added that he knows they realize they can't spend all of theirs, and they have to do something, but he would rather let them come up with a formula and present it.

Grasser commented that he is a little uncomfortable too, as it sounds like Fargo/Moorhead ran their proposals through a separate sub-committee, and because this is a lot for him to digest and he isn't sure he understands all of the permutations of the different decisions, and none of this was vetted through the Technical Advisory Committee, he is a little uncomfortable making a decision. Vein asked if this went through the Technical Advisory Committee. Haugen responded it didn't. Vein asked if there was a reason why we wouldn't do that. Haugen responded that in the past it was felt that this type of thing was a finance issue, and isn't so much a technical issue, so it wouldn't go through the Technical Advisory Committee.

Powers stated that he is inclined to agree. He added that if the NDDOT is so intent on changing the formula, why don't they give us a little direction, why don't they come forward instead of waiting for us to propose something that might bite us down the road. Vein said that it sounds like the intent was for everybody to kind of do this willingly.

Vetter said that he would feel better if the three MPOs got together and came up with something that we could all take back to our respective boards and get it approved, but for each of us to come up with our own proposal, he isn't comfortable.

Discussion ensued.

Vein asked if we can say that in general we are interested in a formula change, we support that, but we aren't willing to state which formula should be approved. DeMers stated that the flip side to this is either you dictate the terms or they get dictated to you, so there is some caution to throwing off our decision making process.

MOVED BY POWERS TO TABLE APPROVING A RECOMMENDATION UNTIL FARGO/MOORHEAD'S BOARD MEETS AND APPROVES THEIR RECOMMENDATION.

Haugen asked if the board would be willing to hold a special meeting once Fargo/Moorhead's board has acted on this as he feels the NDDOT would prefer a decision be made now rather than waiting another month.

DeMers asked if we could make a motion stating that we would recommend the Fargo/Moorhead proposal subject to their approval of it.

POWERS WITHDREW HIS MOTION.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE FORWARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE NDDOT THAT WE SUPPORT THE FARGO/MOORHEAD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL of increasing the base to \$400,000, CONTINGENT ON THE FARGO/MOORHEAD BOARD'S APPROVAL OF SAID PROPOSAL.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AN ADDENDUM TO THE A.T.A.C. CONTRACT TO ADD A WALKABILITY ACTIVITY

Haugen reported that this is the walkability component that we discussed last month. He referred to the packet and pointed out that there is some additional information included as to types of survey instruments that could be developed and used.

Haugen stated that there has been some discussion that this could broaden other activities that are being contemplated in the metro area; including adding the walk friendly status award for both communities to accompany their bronze award for being bike friendly.

Haugen said that this was discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week and they are recommending the contract be executed. He added that the dollar amount is just shy over \$2,000 to add this component to the Near Southside area.

Grasser said that he has a question on this study and similar studies, and that is; what is the expectation of what we are going to get out of it. He stated that he thinks gathering information for expanded knowledge is a great idea, especially for a couple thousand dollars, but if we are giving people the expectation that we are gathering data, and that the comments they are making will be translated into construction projects in a near-term timeframe, he thinks we are doing a disservice to those that are participating. He added that he thinks this question really starts with

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

the Executive Policy Board; what do we think we are going to do with that data, are we gathering data to expand our knowledge so we can make better decisions, or are we going to somehow feel we now have to implement whatever comes out of the study in a financially challenging environment, because he is for one but not the other. He stated that he doesn't want this to cause Federal Highway to look at it and say, well you've measured this now what have you done to accomplish it, because that is something they have been saying, show us how you implement your planning activities.

Malm asked when this walkability study be done. Haugen responded that it will most likely be done in June. Malm commented that he asks this because with all of the construction going on in Grand Forks he doesn't think it will give us good results. Haugen responded that as far as he knows there isn't any construction going on in the area we will be doing this. Malm said, though, that people are driving through those areas because they can't go the way they usually do. He stated that he just thinks that with what is going on right now it doesn't work.

DeMers commented that he agrees somewhat with Mr. Grasser's thoughts on this. He said that to him this is less about the data and the science and what is really out there because he thinks you could get that information by sending one person out to inventory it, but granted it wouldn't be input from outside of things, but it wouldn't take \$2,000 of work to do it. He added that he thinks you are just going to get a very subjective result, and won't be any external validity to the survey, so he doesn't see this as being a very precise tool.

Mock said that she is trying to consider the background that she knows on this versus what is here because she knows the neighbors wanted this, and she knows the MPO got engaged because there is a big group of neighbors that want traffic counts and such to come up with some walkability solutions; but as far as this particular idea of doing this survey, when she looks at some of the questions she is a little concerned because she doesn't know what the MPO or the City can do to control needing more grass and flowers along the walk, or the driver that backs up without looking, or scary people because those are the behaviors of the neighborhood, so she doesn't know if this will accomplish much. She asked, then, if this is an engineering thing that the City recommended to the MPO, is it the MPO's solution to what the neighborhood wanted, or something else. Haugen responded that this is the national common practice of doing these types of walkability surveys, these are just two of them that are out there. He added that neither one will actually be the one we would be using, we would sit down with staff and the neighborhood and come up with pertinent questions that we would use to assess the walkability.

Haugen explained that, as you will recall, part of the discussion last month was to come up with a common definition of what is walkability. He stated that this will give us a chance to work with the neighborhood to come up with a commonality of how we define walkability so when we get future requests for something like this we have a base to work from.

Mock commented that when people were talking about this they wanted to try out some solutions, and they wanted to be very hands on; and she knows Engineering has some concerns about trying to implement things too fast, but she thought what they wanted was to try bump-outs at the corner of Phoenix, and she isn't sure how this gets to that point. Grasser responded that they are working with the neighborhood now, and will be working with Mark Aubol and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

coordinating with the MPO to get traffic counts and different things, because there are going to be some things that we can implement on a test basis, and some we can't, and those we can do on a test basis they are doing.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE ADDENDUM TO THE ATAC CONTRACT TO ADD A WALKABILITY ACTIVITY FOR INFORMATION GATHERING PURPOSES, AND NOT TO INFER IMPLEMENTATION.

DeMers asked if there is any funding that specifically requires this type of measurement as a source, or is this for information only. He explained that he is thinking of Safe Routes to School, and although he doesn't put the proposals together, he doesn't think they have ever done a walkability survey, and we have done safe routes projects. He said that he knows there are different measures that are being proposed, and you have to have all these dashboard kinds of things, but is this tied to a specific thing or just reinforcing information that City Staff probably already knows. Haugen responded that he would say it is the latter.

Vein commented that there is generally a fear that you are going to get a number of people that are going to want a ton of changes to make it walkable and make it look nice, and once you open that door, how far will it go, and what is the next neighborhood going to want to do. He said, though, that on the same token we all want a nice clean walkable city, but it will come at a cost and who will pay that cost and how far will we go.

Grasser agreed that that is his concern, but on the other hand, to him, as an academic it is nice to gather information, and he likes information; he is just leery about expectations about when and how you are going to apply the information. He added, though, that quite frankly he would like to know what people's thoughts are on what makes it walkable, and not as walkable.

Malm asked where you are going to do the study on the Near Southside Neighborhood, how are you going to determine who you are going to deal with. Haugen responded that the study area is primarily Cherry Street, 17th Avenue, and 1st Avenue to the River; that is the area we will do the walkability survey on. He added that this will involve MPO staff, City staff, and will be asking neighborhood volunteers to assist in the process, and there will most likely be two groups going out and they will section the neighborhood into quadrants, depending on how many volunteers there are. Malm stated that he doesn't think we will get any information that will do us one bit of good, so he is opposed to it.

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

Voting Nay: DeMers and Malm.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NDDOT U.S.BUS#2 PROJECT PROGRAMMED FOR 2019

Haugen said, as you will recall, last month he raised this topic, and principally was informing you that the NDDOT was in town last month, and was in town again recently, and they do have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

two projects; North 5th Street and DeMers Avenue, scheduled for 2019. He explained that they are trying to get comments back from individuals and agencies, the MPO being one of them.

Haugen stated that we did talk about the timeline for these projects. He pointed out that, included in the packet was the rest of the information that he didn't share last month. He commented that we talked about, if they do a certain type of project, what opportunities do they believe are doable. He referred to the information in the packet and went over it briefly.

North 5th Street

Haugen reported that, as they do a mill and overlay we do currently have bike facilities identified in our Bike Plan; with the current Bike Plan suggesting sharrows, and previous plans suggesting bike lanes, and we believe that a mill and overlay would be an opportune time to try to implement those. He added that we also note that in the Near North Neighborhood Plan that was developed a few years ago, they were suggesting curb extensions similar, or more extensive than those at St. Mike's at 5th Street and 5th Avenue North.

Grasser asked if the Near North Neighborhood Plan took parking off of 5th. Haugen responded it did not.

DeMers Avenue

Haugen stated that they are suggesting that it will be either a full reconstruction or a mill and overlay. He explained that with the full reconstruction their view is that it would open up the opportunities of adding to just pavement work. He added, however, that even doing a mill and overlay allows for opportunity to do some of these enhancements. He said that we have a certain amount of dollars programmed, so if they do the mill and overlay, which is much less expensive than a full reconstruct, they would have funds to do more enhancements; so we are trying to say that doing a mill and overlay is fine, just that they should do more enhancements as well.

Haugen commented that from a planning perspective, the reconstruction is where it gets a little more tricky, as we have always been told in our planning process that when we recommend a reconstruction of the curb to curb of a street then the feds expect that all of the issues with that area will be addressed with that new pavement, and capacity is one of the traditional things that when you get into reconstruction you may need to add in turn lanes or through lanes. He added that on DeMers Avenue we have been straddling the fence of whether our future forecasts show an acceptable level of service in the future, so far we have been able to do that with the existing two through lanes, but as part of the Sorlie Bridge EIS there was a Draft Traffic Operations Study done, and that study identified that sometime between 2044 and 2057 additional through lanes will likely be required, and we are suggesting that our new transportation plan will get us to the 2045 horizon, so they may need to address this capacity issue.

Haugen said that we do have other plans that they asked questions about as well. He commented our 2008 Downtown Plan did not recommend any curb extension, but did note that there would be upgraded signals in the downtown, and that has happened, so it is suggested that before making any decisions, curb extensions be revisited.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

Haugen reported that in terms of parking, we have always been told by the NDDOT that DeMers Avenue is off limits for us to make any parking changes, so none of our parking plans address any changes to parking.

Haugen commented that they also asked about bike facilities, and we have always treated DeMers as being too constrained to really identify a separate designated bike facility on the roadway, so our planning documents have not recommended a specific facility on DeMers Avenue itself through Downtown Grand Forks. Haugen reported that the DOT is hoping that the MPO will send them a letter addressing these questions. Vein commented that he knows there will be a lot of public input on this. He asked if Mr. Haugen is saying that we are setting the direction with the DOT by our action here, or is that going to have citizen input for the final decision. Haugen responded that we are informing them of what our current plans are recommending for this segment of DeMers Avenue. He added that we were also indicating that we are updating our transportation plans with that public involvement so the timing of their project decision, and the timing of our plan is running on a similar schedule, so we are informing them what our current plans say for DeMers Avenue, not what citizen's input and other things might cause things to change. Vein said, then, that we are making a technical decision, but we aren't getting any input on that decision, they will do that as a parallel, and he doesn't know if he feels comfortable making that recommendation.

Grasser stated that we are referencing old studies, but then we are pulling certain things out of those studies and highlighting or enhancing them, so he would be more comfortable if we just list the studies that they should be thinking about, as opposed to us taking excerpts out of specific studies and trying to enhance them because by doing that we are suggesting that they need to do this, and this, and this; and again he would be more comfortable referencing the studies they should be considering and leaving it at that. He added that he also thinks this discussion, just because we haven't hit 2045, this whole discussion about traffic demand on the Sorlie Bridge is a confusing issue. He said that we made the decision as to what we were going to do with the bridge last year, and he doesn't want to open up any issues with the DOT because of arguing over our being one year into a potential threshold, it seems like an erroneous decision at this point in time as we don't even have our Long Range Transportation Plan done yet to 2045, so it seems to be a confusing issue.

Grasser commented that he isn't comfortable weighing in on a mill and overlay versus a reconstruction project other than the fact that our City Council and Planning Department has it as a reconstruction project on the books.

Vein asked if our current planning documents have been approved by the City Council, so right now the approved project would be a reconstruction of DeMers. Grasser responded that that was submitted to the State in our T.I.P. document. Haugen said, then, if he is hearing correctly, and if the board agrees, the staff report should identify the documents we are suggesting these things come from, rather than the individual things; and we should provide them with copies of our current Bike Plan, our current Street and Highway Element, our 2008 Downtown Plan, and our Downtown Parking Plan for Grand Forks. Vein agreed, saying, though, that the one thing he would add is that he feels we still need to have downtown input before he would want to make a recommendation.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE MPO FORWARD A LIST OF RELEVANT MPO PLANNING DOCUMENTS TO THE NDDOT FOR THEIR REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF ENHANCEMENT OPTIONS SUCH AS BIKE FACILITIES, PARKING, CURB EXTENSIONS, ETC.; AND ALSO A RECOMMENDATION THAT INPUT FROM THE DOWNTOWN BUSINESSES BE SOLICITED, AS WELL.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF U.S.#2/U.S.BUS#2 STUDY UPDATE

Haugen reported that this is the East Grand Forks side U.S.#2/U.S.Bus#2 Study that we have been working with MnDOT and SRF on. He referred to the packet and pointed out that it includes the three alternatives that are being recommended be moved forward into the project development phase.

Haugen stated that none of these three alternatives were the preferred alternative of the Steering Committee. He explained that the alternative they preferred would have smoothed the radius of the lane and created more separation, but MnDOT was only willing to spend a million dollars in this area for improvements to address safety, and that alternative would have cost triple that amount, therefore it is not being further considered.

Haugen said that the draft report is out for review and comment. He added that the Steering Committee did ultimately come to a consensus with these three alternatives being forwarded. He stated that the report was presented to the City Council Work Session last week, and they also agreed to move them forward.

Haugen commented that MnDOT has made a commitment that they will keep the Steering Committee as it goes through the project development phase, so the same parties that worked through this process will continue working through the final phases of the project as well.

Discussion ensued.

Information only.

MATTER OF DRAFT I-29 STUDY

Haugen reported that the Draft I-29 Study Report is out. He pointed out that included in your packet were a few things that were cleaned up from the last meeting.

He explained that we discussed 47th Avenue and the access spacing on either side of the interchange ramps, so there are a series of diagrams that tried to identify the distance/separation between the ramps and what type of access.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

Haugen stated that 47th Avenue has potential for an interchange right at the alignment of 47th, or shifted to the south, so there are a series of drawings that show how the different configurations would have access further away from the interchange.

Haugen commented that there is also an implementation plan that was discussed, that has gone through some modifications, so he included the updated pages from that plan as well. He went over the information briefly.

Haugen reported that also included was the Executive Summary section of the draft report. He stated that the draft report is now out for the Steering Committee's review and comments. He said that they asked that they give their comments to staff by Friday. He added that next Tuesday we will be giving a presentation of the materials to the upper management of the NDDOT, then based on the comment and feedback we get we will be seeking action at the June meeting for approval of the I-29 Study.

Haugen referred to the report and went over the recommendations briefly.

Vein asked about 42nd/DeMers. Haugen responded that they are suggesting that we would get wiser use of the finances available to build a grade separation on 42nd then to not build it and have all that traffic diverted to the Interchange; which then you are going down to the DeMers Interchange and then most of the traffic would go to the Gateway Drive Interchange, etc.

Vein stated that he is talking more about the geometrics of it, and you are showing two options. Haugen responded that he thinks that with the unofficial environmental document there is the "do nothing" option and then there is still "A" and "B" out there as part of the project. Vein said, though, that they aren't proposing anything at this point, they are just showing those two alternatives. Haugen responded that is correct, adding that they narrowed it down from that big universe to these three alternatives: "do-nothing", "swinging to the west" and "both". Vein commented that he asks this because Ray Richards Golf Course apparently doesn't exist anymore, and that has a different rating than it did before, so it might give us new alternatives for that intersection that we didn't have before, so those are options that he sees us looking at if in fact that has now changed.

Information only.

MATTER OF MNDOT FREIGHT PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that principally this is just to inform you that because of FAST, both North Dakota and Minnesota will have to address their Freight Plans. He stated that Minnesota is addressing it in a, there's money on the table now, fashion. He added that they are trying to identify where those funds should be spent.

Haugen commented that if the funds are not spent on the interstate, they have to be spent on a designated critical urban or rural freight corridor. He said that MnDOT is going to solicit project across the State.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday May 17th, 2017**

Haugen said that North Dakota is just beginning their update, and their initial effort is to try to see if mileage can be identified at the start of the process so they are taking a 180-degree different approach than MnDOT is.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 UPWP Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 17TH, 2017,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:20 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, June 21st, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the June 21st, 2017, 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, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Ken Vein, Al Grasser, and Jeannie 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): David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Mike Bittner, KLJ; Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; Scott Mareck, WSB; and Brian Opsahl, Brady-Martz.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 17TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 17TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MPO 2016 AUDIT REPORT

Brian Opsahl, Brady-Martz was present for discussion on the MPO 2016 Audit Report.

Opsahl referred to the Audit Report (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly. He stated that this was a clean audit.

Opsahl reported that Pages 26-28 discuss government auditing standards, and they go through various items over financial reporting and internal controls. He stated that if there had been anything significant it would show up here as a material weakness or significant deficiency, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

there is one deficiency that is a repeat from prior years. He explained, though, that because this is a small entity the auditors prepare the financial statements and have some adjusting journal entries so they bring it to your attention to say that if you had a perfect internal control system you would do your own financial statement and there would be no adjustment, but he would say that 90% to 95% of the smaller entities that they audit have this same comment so don't be alarmed.

Grasser stated that he is involved in a few organizations that have these audits, and knows that with small entities such as the MPO he knows that these internal audit issues are fairly common, but he is wondering, and again all he has as a frame of reference are some of these other groups he is in, but a lot of the time to offset this, or to have a that check and balance they will have either a sub-committee of the governing body, or they will have more detail available as to what the bills are that are being paid so they can track them. He asked if there was a process where we, is there anything we need to be more cognizant of as an organization of having some of those checks and balances.

Opsahl responded that one analysis they would go through would be a segregation of duties or analysis as well, and being that they don't actually have a finding for that he feels indicates that the board is involved in reviewing some of the detailed transactions. He added that you sometimes can't get by the fact that one person can maybe do all the transaction detail during the day, but as long as there is proper oversight, and you try to separate duties when possible, that helps. He said that as long as the financials are being reviewed on a monthly or quarterly basis, and questions are being asked at this level, he thinks that would probably provide enough oversight.

Opsahl commented that there isn't a lot of risk in terms of cash transactions anymore as everything is pretty much all direct deposited; so the only other spots would payroll and disbursements, and his guess is that there is someone signing off on the checks or approving all the bills as they go through, and payroll is generally speaking pretty easy to review as well, so he thinks that mitigates your risk pretty well although there would still be some there.

Grasser asked who on the board is signing off on all those items or is it done internally. Haugen responded that the Chairman signs off on all things that relate to him and his expenses, and he signs off on all staff's and other expenses. He added that in addition our State partners review everything in detail on a monthly basis, and if you recall we also had both the feds and the state do financial audits last year.

Vein commented that one thing they do at the City Council in Grand Forks is approve the payment of bills, but we don't do that here, but that could be something that we could do otherwise we don't see the bills. Powers asked what is considered a bill. Vein responded that it would include payments to consultants/contractors. Powers asked if there is a financial amount attached to the bills, such as anything over \$500 or something. Vein responded that he doesn't know if that is the case or not, as far as he knows all bills are approved regardless of the amount, so everything the City pays for the council approves. He asked if the City of East Grand Forks and the counties do the same. The response from both entities is that they do follow a similar procedure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

Grasser said that it would seem that we would be more consistent with our partners if we did this kind of procedure. Opsdahl stated that he has seen it done lots of different ways; some entities approve anything over \$100 or \$500; others have a summary of bills, but generally speaking they do see some kind of review at the board level to approve the bills.

Grasser asked if there is a need to make a policy change to do something like this, how would we proceed if we want to implement this. Haugen responded that it wouldn't be a policy change, it would just be a directive from the Board to have a monthly summary of the bills each month.

Vein stated that he would agree that it would be a good thing to have a list of bills that could be approved by the board, but unless there is a question they wouldn't have to go through the bills monthly.

Vein asked how this would impact the payment of the bills. Haugen responded that we currently pay the bills as we receive them, so this would slow the payment down by a few days.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE RECEIVING AND FILING THE MPO 2016 AUDIT REPORT, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Kouba reported that preliminary approval of the Transit Development Plan was given by the board back in April, and since then there have been a few changes made, mostly due to input from a public meeting and comments from both city councils.

Kouba commented that both city councils have approved this final draft Transit Development Plan, and the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending the board approve it as well.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT TRANSIT DEVELOPOMENT PLAN, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATION STUDY REPORT

Haugen reported that a copy of the Executive Summary was included in the packet, and Mr. Bittner, KLJ, is here for a brief presentation as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

Bittner commented that at this point they have completed seven phases of the project that are all available on the website for review. He added that there is also the Executive Summary, which kind of ties up all of the phases in 200 pages of technical information.

Bittner stated that some of the things he will cover with the presentation include level of service, costs (all 2017 dollars which is important to note because none of the improvements are recommended for 2017 so they will all increase in cost as you start to look at your metropolitan transportation plan). He added that the improvements that he is going to show on the slide show are really concepts only, and as you get into project development, and you start to actually build these they will be refined and they will evolve naturally.

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

Grasser commented that the project at 42nd and DeMers shows an exposure of 749,000, and he is wondering if it would put our quiet zone at risk. Bittner responded that he would have to take a closer look at this before he could answer. He added, though, that he knows that through the Glasston Study it picked up. Haugen stated that the Glasston Study did look at it but he doesn't believe it went out to the Year 2040. Bittner said that this would be something that would be pretty easy to calculate. Haugen stated that you would have to take a guess at what that threshold is going to be, it fluctuates a lot more than you would ever think it should. Grasser said that he was just curious if it blew us way off, one way or the other.

Bittner reported that the biggest issue in the future is at 32nd Avenue, and what they found was that there was so much growth occurring on the south/southwest portion of Grand Forks that it is pouring a lot of traffic through this interchange and the only improvement that they found could solve this problem was by adding an interchange at 47th Avenue. He referred to a drawing illustrating the layout of what that interchange would look like and went over it.

Bittner stated that our need is really by 2025, but we think there are some smaller spot improvements that could prolong the life of the interchange to 2030 at the very latest. He referred to a slide listing these improvements and went over them briefly.

Bittner commented that one important aspect of this interchange is kind of a chicken and the egg situation. He explained that the interchange at 32nd is getting oversaturated with growth but to support that future growth you need the roadways to connect there, and to support an interchange you need the roadways to connect there, so until you have the support system set up you won't really see the needs at 32nd Avenue, so the timing is really contingent upon that growth and seeing those roadways support some of that development, so the need and supply really go hand in hand at this location.

Grasser said that he thinks this will be a challenge for them, and not just financially, but in the discussion he really finds two discussions going on; we talk about the interchange, not you necessarily, but he has had discussion with the NDDOT as well; and it is like, well, if you want an interchange you need to do this, and this, and this, and this; that would be the normal type of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

conversation he would see if we wanted an interchange, but this isn't an interchange we want, this is an interchange to mitigate what otherwise would be more expensive on 32nd Avenue South, so he isn't sure how to move the conversation in that direction as opposed to, well if we do this then you have to this, and this, and this. He said that he agrees that we do need to make improvements, but to be honest he almost feels a little bit held hostage, because they say they aren't going to approve this interchange unless you have money on the table to do...no; okay I don't have the money to do those roads, now what are you going to do on 32nd Avenue South, and he is trying to figure out how to nicely portray that because really the challenge is the DOT as 32nd Avenue South is their vote, so he isn't sure what the answer is but this is one of the challenges we have when we have this discussion because he wants them to be thinking not in terms of, well if we give you this, you have to give us this; its like the DOT has a problem you have to solve and he knows it will be a challenge because the resolution is off system, so to speak because 47th isn't an NHS system road.

Bittner stated again that this is what he meant by the chicken and the egg, because to have a problem you need the development, to have the development you need to have a road to get there, so that is the trick. Grasser added that the problem is you have to program these things six years out so he doesn't want them to keep pushing off the programming because we don't have all of this other stuff figured out, he thinks we need to get it programmed, and the challenge is for the City to help figure out how to fill some of that in because he is afraid this road is going to get pushed off, and now we are talking about the underpass and the interchange, but the underpass shouldn't be on the table because the underpass should have already been done, so now we are building up these problems.

Presentation continued.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE I-29 TRAFFIC OPERATIONS STUDY REPORT, AS PRESENTED.

Mock asked if this is approving the study to be filed for potential future use, or are we saying that these are priorities going forward. Haugen responded that it is more of a receive and file motion. He added that the last agenda item today, our kickoff to the 2045 Street/Highway Plan will help us prioritize and put in the fiscal constraint component to all of the recommendations, and that will sort of be the point where we decide which ones in the timeline we can actually get done with the financial resources we have, so this was getting us set up so we knew what should be done if we had all the money in the world, the next step is when we prioritize the street and highway plan update, and to say that these are the projects that we are going to try to achieve by 2045 with the fiscal resources we have available.

Grasser asked, if we, the City of Grand Forks or NDDOT District Engineer were to ask to do the 47th Avenue Interchange in the next T.I.P. request, which is 2023, would we not be able to approve that as an executive committee because of financial constraints. Haugen responded that that is right. He added that we would only be able to put it in the T.I.P. as an illustrative project. Grasser said, then, that we are already slipping on our timeline, is where he is at with all these things, and he doesn't know how to solve that but if we keep building projects and not getting

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

them solved. Vein commented that that is a finance issue, and that is one of the things, obviously we are looking at with options, in this case sales tax, so if we have good data this report will play into that for identifying need, and then we can do it as a prioritization.

Powers stated that he wants to be sure and clear on this, but in your opinion the 32nd Avenue Interchange is the top priority. Bittner responded that you can kind of see the need, right. He added that today there is one issue, in 2025 there is another priority, so it really comes down to whether or not you can fund two projects by 2025, or can you only fund one project by 2025; so if you can only fund one then you should look at your 2025 needs, if you can fund both that would be great, but it really comes down to the fact that they have done a really good job of establishing needs and solutions, but at the end of the day there isn't anything he can do to help with the funding.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE U.S.#2/U.S.BUS#2 STUDY REPORT

Haugen reported that this study was done as the result of MnDOT identifying a year ago a pavement project they were going to do on U.S.#2. He explained that they looked at the intersection of U.S.#2/U.S.Bus#2 and thought that they could do a simple closure, and as a result of that request we did this study to show that there are other alternatives that should be pursued.

Haugen stated that in the end we were able to narrow the alternatives down to just three options that could be forwarded as they go through the project development stage, and MnDOT has agreed to pursue and implement one of these three options and have increased their budget.

Strandell asked if MnDOT are limited to these three alternatives, or can they still go off on their own and do a different project. Haugen responded that if they go off on their own, it will depend on how far off they go. He explained that if they try to shrink down to a complete closure they would not be consistent with our plans anymore, so we would question whether we can maintain it in our T.I.P. program, so yes they can, but it would depend on how far you are contemplating they go. Strandell stated that he isn't contemplating anything, he is hoping that they don't deviate from these options.

Haugen commented that because some of the property is within City limits they would also need to have City consent on the project as well, so besides the MPO, the City would have some leverage on which project they do as well.

Haugen stated that they also had a Steering Committee formed, they made a commitment to keep the Steering Committee active as they finalized the project so that Steering Committee, which you are a member of, will keep them on their toes as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

Powers asked if the council had approved this. Vetter responded that they had. Malm asked which alternative the council approved. Vetter responded that they approved the three alternatives, they didn't pick one of the three, they just said that they could go with any one of the three. Strandell pointed out that Alternative 1 is no-build, that wouldn't do any good. Vetter responded that he doesn't even look at that as an alternative, the alternatives are the turn lane improvements and/or the modified R-Cut.

Haugen commented that they are really trying to implement Alternative 2A.

Powers asked if they were trying to narrow it down to one today. Haugen responded that we aren't narrowing it down to one, we are just approving this as it is presented.

***MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE
U.S.#2/U.S.BUS.#2 STUDY, AS PRESENTED.***

Malm asked if they wanted Alternative 1 removed from the plan. Mock stated that you can't take a "no-build" option off. Malm said we can recommend taking it off; you know, somewhere down the line someone's got to tell them you can't do that. Haugen responded that in this context the "no-build" is to not do any project at all, it isn't to do the closure, so as they move from this planning study into actual project development, the "no-build" is always an alternative we have to list in that project development process, and as you spend money on the project development there is still that option that if you can't reach an agreement, that you can select a "no-build" option.

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

Voting Nay: Malm.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

**MATTER OF ADOPTION OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2040 STREET/HIGHWAY
ELEMENT**

Haugen reported that when we adopted our 2040 Street and Highway Element back in December 2013, at that time MnDOT told us that they didn't foresee any projects in the Street and Highway Plan identified on their Trunk Highway System in the MPO area, but a year ago they came to us and said that after further analysis they have two projects that the needed to get into our Long Range Transportation Plan.

Haugen stated that the first project was the one we just discussed with the U.S.#2/U.S.Bus.#2 Study; and the second one is replacing the bridge structure over the River Road Interchange.

Haugen explained that what we are doing today is bringing those two projects into our Long Range Transportation Plan, so that when they request programming of the projects in our T.I.P. we can say they are consistent with our planning documents. He said that in addition, they are bringing the funding to the table so this is just tying up the process and saying that we are adopting these projects into our Street and Highway Element so they are consistent with the request for programming the dollars when that time comes.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

Haugen commented that you can see with the attachment to the staff report the 10-year Highway Capital Investment Plan that MnDOT does annually, they do have those two projects identified, so in order to keep our planning and programming documents consistent between us and the State, amending our Transportation Plan is necessary.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE FINAL ADOPTION OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE 2040 STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN ELEMENT, AS PRESENTED.

DeMers asked, in regard to the second project, at what time do the local jurisdictions get to add input to the scope of work. Haugen responded that we did have discussion a year ago with the locals on that project. He added that, again, we will be updating the Street and Highway Plan, and part of the City Council motion to approve included a statement that MnDOT was aware that there will be some discussion about reopening the ramps to the east, so that will be part of the Street and Highway Plan Update. He said, though, that really when the project development starts, that project is scheduled for 2025, so by the time they start doing the project development and maintaining the 2025 schedule we will probably have another update to our Street and Highway Plan by then, so that is the process.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF DRAFT NDDOT S.T.I.P.

Haugen reported that typically the process is that the MPO would adopt a draft T.I.P., submit it to the State, and they would then assemble the MPO T.I.P.s and the rest of the State's program into a draft S.T.I.P. He added that this would normally be doing this in April, but this past April we only adopted a Minnesota Side T.I.P. as North Dakota was not prepared to do anything.

Haugen stated that late May or early June the NDDOT informed us that they were releasing a Draft S.T.I.P., and told us that it was up to the MPOs if they still wanted to do a Draft T.I.P. document. He said that after they released their Draft S.T.I.P., we really didn't have the time to follow our adoption process in June to do a T.I.P., so staff is not suggesting, or pursuing doing a Draft T.I.P. document.

Haugen commented that the Draft S.T.I.P. still has some gaps in it, if you will. He said that there are some programs that aren't showing up, but nonetheless there are some important things that are listed; the first one we heard a little with the I-29 Study and that is that we did have a request for safety funds to do some turning lane improvements on 32nd Avenue, they are programming that in 2019, so that is a major project that is now showing up in the Draft S.T.I.P.

Haugen stated that we also know that the City was awarded one of their three transportation alternative projects, it is attached as well, so we are aware of some new awards that we weren't previously aware of.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

Haugen reported that the other thing, and he didn't highlight yet, but that is very important is that the T.I.P. covers four years, and the last year of their Draft S.T.I.P. is blank for the Urban Program, so we don't know how the State is thinking of what projects are programmed for 2021, and we had a couple of very significant projects proposed; the Washington Street underpass being reconstructed and Columbia Road, north of the overpass, also being reconstructed.

Haugen stated that the reason North Dakota is withholding that final year is because they aren't quite sure what the federal funding will be, and they are also unsure how a new Director might proceed with that 2021 year so they decided to release a Draft S.T.I.P. but not identify any of the 2021 projects.

Haugen commented that the good thing was that we got the safety project and one of our three alternative projects programmed, but on the flip side we aren't really sure where we stand on our 2021 projects. Vein asked if we have any choice. Haugen responded that this is out for public comment so you could provide comments, but they released their Draft S.T.I.P. and we will be working with them on a Final T.I.P., assuming, again, that they are going to follow the schedule of an August approval timeframe, and assuming that they will process things in a normal cycle, now that they've drafted a S.T.I.P. we will be finalizing our document in August.

Vein commented that to him it is obvious, we never know what the feds are going to do so that isn't any different then we've had before, and if we have a new NDDOT Director, we've been through them before too, so he isn't quite sure why we wouldn't still propose to have our projects on the list. Haugen responded that our candidate projects are still being considered until they would release their decision to take them off, so they aren't on a list that they are committing funding for them though.

Grasser stated that part of the challenge that the City Council is going to have, and staff, is that they are asking for the next round of requests, and we start that process in August/September to get through the approval process, so if they denied the request for reconstruction of Columbia Road by University Avenue, we might put that back on the next request, but if they approve it we might be in a Catch 22 about what our next request should be, is it a new project or a re-ask of the old project, because sometimes they don't approve them because of their projected cash flow issues. He said that they did ask, because he was a little bit concerned that a new director might actually change the direction of dollars that might come to the City for the Urban Program, but he thinks that what he heard is that would be very unlikely that they would change their program, but it still makes him nervous

Vein commented that his concern is that our new Governor wants to see more downtown development, and doesn't want some of these other things, so that may impact the direction we go too, but it would be nice to stay committed to where we've been, and let that message be known, and then if we have to adjust because of dwindling funds we'll have to do that, but there is also discussion of major infrastructure programs nationwide, and we would want to make sure our projects are listed in case more money becomes available too.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT KICK-OFF

Haugen reported that we have our project team, Kimley-Horn and WSB here today. He said that, included in the staff report was a power point that they would like to go through with you.

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

Grasser asked what the dollar amount is for this study. Haugen responded that it is \$285,000.

Grasser stated that we had a discussion, or comment here earlier about wondering what the Governor may propose, how things may move forward and we know that he is a big advocate for downtown development, and we were wondering about potentially are we going to re-allocate resources to advocate some of those activities; and it occurs to him that we are in the very very early stages of this report, and he is wondering if we shouldn't include in here, or add, or whatever; let's say we took 50% of Grand Forks' growth for the downtown, and 250 people a year go downtown, and we compound that over a 25 or 30 year period, what would our network then change to compared to, because right now the things we have are based on what we think is our growth, if outside conditions, whatever they may be, push that into the downtown area, what would those results be. He said that he is just wondering if we shouldn't set some of the stage for that, we could always drop it later on, but we are in the early stages and it seems like if we set some of those things up at this stage, it might be less onerous than if we try to do it later.

Vein commented that his only question is is what do you set up, you can only do it on speculation and a little on what we talked about, so it would seem that maybe in six months or a year from now we may have a better idea of what is going on, but we will never be in a perfect position to know all the information we need to plan for, it is going to always be changing. Grasser stated that that is why he just picked a number because six months from now we will be so far down the line on this that it will be hard to go back and recreate any of that data, but he is just throwing it out there, and he has been known to throw out DOA ideas before. Vein said that this is something that maybe the Technical Advisory Committee can talk about and make a recommendation back to us.

Haugen stated that it isn't that complicated to give you an analysis, it's the 2030 loaded network and the 2045 loaded network, and we could run just an alternative land use scenario where you would focus on the downtown and the model would tell us what type of trips would be attracted to that and what the level of congestion would be on those roadways, if that is the sense of what you want.

Grasser responded that he doesn't want to reinvent the whole world, but if there is a simple way of doing it upfront like this he thinks there might be some value. Haugen said, then, that he isn't hearing that you are expecting them to go into re-analysis that we have to do elevated roadways downtown to get people there, you just want a sense of what happens. Grasser responded that unless six months from now we find out that something really might drive us to something like that, that is exactly his idea.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday June 21st, 2017**

Bourdon commented that it literally would be one of the alternatives that would be picked for a travel demand model with the understanding that not every future project is going to be refined in this detail, but you would certainly have a better idea if what that type of development would result in, if you have a bunch of different infrastructure items failing, compared to what you may have with other alternatives. Merack said that the other thing he would add to that is, late last year WSB helped the MPO and the City work through a new growth plan for the City of Grand Forks, and a similar plan was put together for East Grand Forks, and that was based on a kind of philosophy to infill as much as possible in the existing urban area, and then basically concentric rings of developing from the perimeter of the existing group of development slowly outward based upon some tiered growth areas. He stated that that approach was taken for the land use plan that you currently approved, and that land use is now being input into the ATAC Travel Demand Model. He added that they did not look at it from the standpoint of probably the extent that you are suggesting, whether it would be 50% of the growth in the downtown, but there was kind of a sustained mobility smart growth, if you will, orderly development pattern that is in the current land use plan that would improve those facilities we put into our travel demand mode.

Vein said that he would add just one comment, having to do with DeMers/42nd Street cross section of what we have there; now that the golf course is no longer a park that opens up a lot of different options of what the interchange might look like, and what the costs might be with that, so that is something that we need to somehow incorporate into some of our options as we go down the road. Grasser stated that you will see some allowance for dollars in the next CIP he thinks.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 UPWP Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 21ST, 2017,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:21 P.M.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, August 16th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the August 16th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent was: Al Grasser.

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

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 21ST, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE JUNE 21ST, 2017,
MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF MPO BOARD MEMBER ELIGIBILITY

Haugen reported that this is an interpretation of the MPO By-Laws on the eligibility of board membership. He explained that a year ago the Grand Forks City Engineer was appointed to represent the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission, and that appointment raised a question as to whether or not that person was eligible to be on the board.

Haugen commented that at that time the City Engineer in Grand Forks was a full-voting member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, but based on a similar scenario, in 1999 the MPO

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

Board made a decision, or interpretation, that in order to represent the body that you are being appointed to represent, you also needed to have the same privileges as everyone else on that body. So a year ago the City Engineer had such privileges, but recently Grand Forks significantly changed its Planning and Zoning Commission membership, and one of the things they did was to remove the voting privileges of the City Engineer. He said that this then brought up the question of whether the City Engineer is still eligible to be on the MPO Board or not.

DeMers stated that his take on this is that this is a policy board, and while he thinks City Engineers, and specifically Mr. Grasser, was a benefit to this board, he thinks we need to have separation between the Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Board. He added that he has a problem with City Staff on either side being a member of the Policy Board, and he feels that we should have policy people on this board and have that separation of staff, so he would even say, at some point, that we should revise our By-Laws or Policy to state that whether staff holds a voting position on a commission or committee, a non-staff person should be the representative on the MPO Board because he thinks there becomes a little bit of a conflict, not that Mr. Grasser did anything that was a conflict of interest, but he thinks that it becomes a little bit of a circular conflict, maybe; and the more policy voices we can get added into this the better, but he is willing to hear what others think as well.

Vein commented that he thinks Mr. DeMers makes some valid arguments, but he does see pros and cons to it. He stated that in this case, the By-Laws just say that it needs to be one member each from Grand Forks and East Grand Forks Planning Commission, it doesn't say that it needs to be a voting or non-voting member, so the By-Laws, for him, just seems to allow for the selection of representation to be made by that body, so his interpretation is that unless we change the By-Laws, it is allowed. He added that, regardless of the discussions were in the past, or whatever, he doesn't see that interpretation in the way the By-Laws are written today, and the Planning and Zoning Commission made the recommendation that they be put on here as their representative, and the City Council decided that that position, even though it is a staff position, should still be a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, which is the policy commission, even though they are non-voting, they have them, so with respect to that process, that is why his thought was that it still fits within our policies, and it fit within the representation that brought it here.

Vetter stated that he doesn't necessarily disagree with Mr. Vein that the By-Laws weren't changed by the Board back in 1999; although they apparently addressed this issue but didn't change the By-Laws. Vetter commented that when he looks at policy boards, his take is that you set up a policy board to gather input from the community, and you can't gather input from the community if you continually have City employees on the policy board, you are going to get a skewed policy then, so the more diversity we can have on the policy board the better off he thinks everyone is in the long run. So he agrees with Mr. DeMers, and he also thinks we need to change the By-Laws to align with what the Board did back in 1999, but didn't take the next step to change the By-Laws to reflect it, so he would be more in favor of members of the board having to have voting rights to be able to serve on our policy board.

Mock asked how long is that appoint supposed to be, is for a year or two. Vein responded that he believes it is for two years. Haugen explained that normal terms are for two years. Mock

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

stated that it seems like maybe there are two separate issues; under the current interpretation of the By-Laws she would tend to agree that it seems like his position is still on the Planning and Zoning Commission so under those interpretations she would agree that he is eligible to stay on the policy board. She added that she thinks he has a really unique perspective knowing kind of the long term and the short term half of the city and needs as they change, which is a really important perspective for something like this and the planning we do, but it almost seems like changing the By-Laws is a separate issue, maybe one that we should consider as an item on the agenda if that is the direction everyone thinks it go.

DeMers stated that he doesn't doubt that Mr. Grasser, specifically, doesn't bring a pretty good perspective; but part of his point is that that perspective is better suited through the technical end, which already has a standing spot and although he may not be the one doing it, it is his staff, his office, it is his responsibility; so he thinks that is the proper role for that type of advisement. He added that part of the function of City staff is to advise policy boards and get us in the same page so that our interactions with our constituents can reflect that; and as Mr. Vetter said, part of it is communication, and as we allow it to become more tight knit it might make better sense, but it doesn't allow for that better spin-off of communication and allow more people access to more information so that when we do make long-term plans it can make more sense to more people. He commented that, while this isn't a sword he is willing to die on, he really thinks for proper functioning of boards, there should be a separation of staff versus elected or appointed officials. He cited how weird it would be if, and not just a City Engineer, but what if the Finance Director was a member of the City Council, it would really be weird, and for that reason that is why a lot of statutes don't allow that because staff has a certain role and may have an obligation to stay fairly open minded to be able to take policy that is directed to them and implement it, and the problem he sees with this is if you are part of the policy making, and then you are also asked to implement, there can be conflict of interest.

Powers asked what the process is for amending the By-Laws to clear this up. Haugen responded that it would depend on the extent you would want to amend the By-Laws. He explained that back in 1998-1999 we had two attorneys engaged, and there were a lot of changes to the By-Laws, but just to change the By-Laws themselves the process would be to submit the proposed changes, and have the proposal on the agenda for two months. He added that anyone can bring changes forward, but the board cannot act on those changes until they have been on the agenda twice; and then, if there are a lot of changes, there would be the process of engaging additional entities or attorneys as well.

Vein stated that he thinks we can have a fairly lengthy discussion on this now, but what he thinks he is hearing so far is that these are two separate issues, and that it should promote a By-Law change that we would discuss under a separate topic at a future meeting. DeMers responded that the point he thinks Mr. Vetter is making is that it was discussed and it became more of a standard operating procedure that wasn't formalized, so he understands the idea that while it may not meet the letter of the law it would allow this to go forward, but if people are willing to discuss changing the By-Laws he would be willing to go forward and allow this at this time.

Vetter commented that his argument probably isn't going to change any because the City Council made this decision on behalf of the City of Grand Forks that that person be an

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

administrator on a policy board, and they are bringing that person forward so we are going with that, but he also thinks that it is a separate discussion then what we are having today because no matter what the intent or discussion was twenty years ago; unless somebody interprets it differently he doesn't see where there is a violation of the current By-Law.

Mock asked if there were other portions of the By-Laws that need to be updated as well. Haugen responded that you will notice in the By-Laws that it does list the Finance Committee; and last time we met there was discussion about our audit report and who reviews the bills; and the By-Laws do state that the Finance Committee was intended to meet monthly to perform the function of reviewing the bills, which they did for many years but then it was felt that there wasn't a need to hold another meeting on top of other meetings to review things so a decision was made by a current board that that function was no longer required.

Vein asked when the Finance Committee last met. Haugen responded that the last time they formally met was about two years ago; however, just as there are a lot of State Statutes on the books that just sit there waiting to be implemented if needed, maybe that is where the Finance Committee is currently, it is there if it is needed, but past boards have not had a desire to use that function. He added that one power the Finance Committee does have, although it isn't listed in the By-Laws, is they can approve expenditures up to a value of \$5,000; and much of the past Finance Committee meetings that have been held have been to address that kind of issue, such as a piece of equipment or something of that nature.

Vein stated that those are things that we should talk about and then we should look at the By-Laws in general and then discuss any changes we want to make to them so if this could be placed on the agenda for our next meeting. DeMers asked if staff could look into what other MPOs do regarding eligibility on their boards as well

DeMers asked if we read our policy as it is right now, could Planning and Zoning put forward someone that isn't even on their board, because it says someone appointed by the representative body, it doesn't even say it has to be a member, just a representative for them. Vein suggested that we should bring some clarity to that as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2018-2021 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P.

Haugen reported that the action you take today is absent of a recommendation from the Technical Advisory Committee as they did not have a quorum last week. He said that a public hearing was held, however there were no written comments submitted, and no one came to the meeting. He stated that staff does recommend approval of the Final 2018-2021 Minnesota Side T.I.P., as presented.

Haugen explained that we did adopt a Draft 2018-2021 Minnesota Side T.I.P. back in April, and there have been no significant changes made to that document. He said that there is a total of just over \$15,000,000.00 on the Minnesota side being spent on transportation projects during that

four year period; two big projects make up the bulk of that, the first one is next year whereby MnDOT is using federal funds to payback their financing of the Kennedy Bridge project that is currently going on and the other is the 2021 project whereby they will be doing pavement work

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

on the westbound U.S. #2. He pointed out that we did add an additional \$1,000,000.00 to help address the safety issue at the U.S.#2/U.S.Bus.#2 intersection.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2018-2021 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

Strandell asked, on the discussion issue, what has happened with the study that was done on U.S.#2/U.S.Bus.#2 as far as whether or not the State of Minnesota has made any decisions as to what the project design will be. Haugen responded that they haven't. He added that it will be happening probably a year out yet. He added that once it has been programmed, and they have the funding available, since this is 2021, they typically don't fast forward the design of these, they usually wait a year or two before they will really begin engaging in how they are going to end up designing it and will run it through the full NEPA process, etc., for project development.

Haugen commented that MnDOT has agreed to continue looking at those three options, or the do-nothing option; and they agreed to add the monies into the project so it is available when they do the project.

Strandell asked if the three alternatives are the ones on the table or will there be others. Haugen responded that we would hope that our study examined all possibilities, but he can't guarantee there won't be others that are brought up two years from now. Strandell stated that there are some that don't trust the DOT, as far as following our study results.

Haugen commented that every year this body has the ability to question what is being programmed in that project, so just as the Kennedy, if there are questions about what is being programmed you can determine whether or not you want to continue programming monies toward that project, and they have the obligation to be consistent with that study's recommendations.

DeMers asked, when Grand Forks did their quiet zone were there federal monies applied to it. Haugen responded that he would have to review back, but off the top of his head his answer would be no, the investments were relatively small, but he can't say for certain that there weren't.

DeMers stated that he asked because East Grand Forks is starting to engage in a discussion on this, so it would be nice to know if at some point we want to try to target monies. Haugen responded that he thinks that a significant amount of the Grand Forks quiet zone monies came from State funds. He explained that the State Legislature, for a couple of years, provided State monies to implement quiet zones. DeMers said that he thought there was federal/rail grants. Haugen responded that there are, adding it is an eligible HSIP, or Highway Safety Improvement Program because there is a subset to that program which is for railroad crossings. He said that it is eligible, however how the project competes with changing crossings from just standard crossings to having flashing lights, it doesn't compete well with that level of safety need.

Haugen commented, though, that this would be eligible for the City's Sub-target funds.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that our consultants are working through the scope-of-work. He said that they have identified the public engagement schedule, with the first open house occurring on August 30th at the Empire Art Center.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and gave a brief overview of what will be taking place at the open house; stating that this is the initial first step through this and, ultimately twelve months from now we will have a draft plan for consideration.

Vein asked how long the presentation will be. Haugen responded that they are trying to schedule no more than twenty minutes for their end of the presentation, but depending on the questions and such it could be longer.

Haugen commented that this open house is the first of four total that we will be doing on the front end of the update process. He said that a year from now, assuming we are still on schedule, we will be going to each Planning Commission and City Council for public hearings for the official sets of public engagement beyond this.

Mock asked if, when you talk about pavement conditions, does it include drivability or is it just the true conditions. Haugen responded that the map that is included in here does not address that issue. He said that they do have the data, but they are still working on this as there are six jurisdictions and they all have not exactly the same type of data gathering, so they are trying to make it so that they can present sort of one piece of information that captures pavement condition. He added that most of the North Dakota roadways will have that information, it is the Minnesota side that won't have it. Mock explained that the reason she asked this is because sometimes she thinks people evaluate things by what they perceive as far as potholes and drivability versus what engineering staff will say is the truth.

Haugen commented that on the North Dakota side this data is all from the State Legislature's Transportation Needs Study that was done, and we are only displaying the data for the Federal Aid eligible roadways, we aren't going down to the local street level. Vein stated that he thinks it will be important if the MPO plan and what they are looking at from the City Council be aligned with conditions and proposals.

Haugen reported that as far as the Travel Demand Model portion of the study is concerned, the information he would share is, as technology advances, data gathering advances, we are having a whole lot more information engaged in this modeling effort than we have in the past.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

Haugen stated that one of the things the State of North Dakota primarily did was to purchase some origin destination data. He commented that, if you recall, we had a discussion about cell phone pings, and we have that data and that is a landmine of information as to where people are going, and why they are going there, whether it is home based or non-home based, so we are getting a good pattern of traffic in the Grand Forks and East Grand Forks area, and it is all gathered through the whole month of October of 2015.

Haugen reported that they are now engaging both City's Staff on trying to get some idea of what our street network will look like in 2030, just assuming we aren't making major investments, but just standard build-out of the city for 2030. He stated that the next one, then, would be 2045, so we are working with staff on also distributing where growth is occurring in both communities so they are working on the model.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA FREIGHT PLAN UPDATE

Haugen reported that, as you heard from past meeting, particularly on the Minnesota side; Congress has created a new freight program within the FAST ACT, and with that each State was required to identify critical freight corridors, and they split it between urban and rural, and in our case urban was what we were asked to work with.

Haugen stated that in December we talked about how Minnesota was approaching this, and that is to solicit for projects, then they will prioritize those projects, and those at the top, whatever corridor they are on will be designated as an urban corridor.

Haugen said that North Dakota took the opposite approach and they engaged UGPTI to try to identify corridors before soliciting for projects. He added that there is a geographic limit and a mileage limit placed on this by the feds.

Haugen referred to a map and explained that it is the map that was generated. He said that UGPTI and the NDDOT sent an email to all three MPOs saying that they have a week to review these maps and get back to them with what they feel is better. He stated that he convened a meeting of the City, County and State local staff people and came up with this map. He went over the map briefly.

Vein asked if there is a limit to the number miles we can have on this system. Haugen responded that there is a twenty-five mile limit. He stated that the total urban freight corridor mileage is seventy-five for the entire State, so the three MPOs have split that into twenty-five for each MPO. Vein said, then, that you manipulated this map to hit that twenty-five mile limit. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that the one odd thing you may notice is Columbia Road is not designated. He explained that the reason for that is because trucks are not allowed on the overpass.

Powers asked why I-29 and U.S.#2 are excluded. Haugen responded that they are excluded from the mileage because they are already part of the National Freight Network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed this in July, so this is what the NDDOT and UGPTI are now digesting; and they will get back to us as to whether they concur with it or if they have a suggested change they would like us to consider.

Haugen commented that this is a map on the federal program side of things. He added that North Dakota also has a strategic freight network, and they adopted that plan a couple of years ago. Now they want to follow up and go inside the urban areas and try to figure out what should be on the State Freight priority system. He stated that there is similar mileage, but there are a few more designated as we weren't bound by the geography limits, nor by a mileage cap, so they have a lot of the same areas or streets identified. He added that on the North Dakota side they have them stratified in levels; level one would be the Interstate and U.S.#2, level two would be Highway 81/Washington Street and DeMers, and level three would be the rest.

DeMers asked if the twenty-five miles is set in stone or could there be push-back from Fargo saying they want additional miles. Haugen responded that the direction was clear that each MPO has twenty-five miles.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

b. INFRA Grant Solicitation

Haugen reported that there are a couple of grand opportunities; one at the federal level is called INFRA grant. He explained that it has taken two years of federal funds and is asking for entities to submit proposals. He stated that this is open for another two months and you just submit directly to the U.S. Government Website, and if any of the local entities are submitting a project they must have some sort of letter from the MPO indicating how that project fits with our planning and programming processes.

Haugen commented that they are emphasizing, more than ever before, on the federal side a strong private public partnership within the proposals, so instead of there being an 80/20 funding they are hoping to have a lessor responsibility so money can go farther and there is more private capital going into it.

c. MnDOT Local Roads Improvement Program

Haugen reported that on the Minnesota side there is State monies available for local road improvement program and that solicitation is open until November so there is opportunity. He stated that when this announcement was released he forwarded to City staff and suggested that perhaps the proposed roundabout would fit this program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday August 16th, 2017**

DeMers asked what the typical funding level is for this program; there is \$25,000,000.00 there for projects throughout the State, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct, and he thinks there is a cap to it, but he will look into it further and pass the information on.

d. Bill Listing For 7/15/17 To 8/15/17 Period

Haugen reported that you asked for the MPO bill listings, this is a list of the bills we had during the July 15, 2017 to August 15, 2017 period.

e. New NDDOT Director

Haugen reported that the new NDDOT Director is now in his second week on the job. He stated that his name is Tom Sorrell, and he does come from an extensive work background in Minnesota, first as the Federal Highway Division Administrator, and then the MnDOT Director.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 16TH, 2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:54 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 20th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the September 20th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent was: Warren Strandell.

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

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 16TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 16TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF UPDATE TO MPO BY-LAWS

Haugen reported that at your last meeting the board requested two things; one was a draft By-Law amendment clarifying whether staff members can serve or not, so included in the packet was a one page document trying to accomplish this. He said that the other thing was to find out what other regional MPOs are doing with this kind of issue as well.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (included in the packet and available upon request) and explained that he used the three States of Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota; and talked to the Executive Directors of these agencies and put together the survey chart showing

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

what their By-Laws state as far as whether they are specific about allowing staff, or if they are silent.

Haugen said that, as noted in the Staff Report, there are three MPOs that do allow staff to serve, but they are a little unique in who those staff people represent. He explained that for Duluth-Superior, the staff person that is currently serving on the MPO Board is technically a citizen from Duluth as appointed by the Mayor of Duluth to represent the Citizens of Duluth. He added that you will also notice in this presentation that a lot of the MPO Boards, particularly a lot of Minnesota ones, have large bodies, lots of membership; and Rochester has a staff representative from their School District serving on their MPO Board, and the School District sends their Superintendent of Schools. He commented that Rapid City allows their Regional Airport Authority to have a seat on their MPO Board, and the Airport sends their Executive Director.

Haugen stated that there is also a follow-up question as to whether or not these MPOs allow staff proxies to attend, because that was one of the issues back twenty years or so ago that our MPO Board was trying to address, and that is a little more varied. He explained that for some of them that allow staff proxy, it is just a matter of practice that their board has never addressed; for others it is a matter, such as Rapid City, they have their Mayor as a voting member of their board and their Mayor prefers not to attend and sends the Planning Director in his place, so it isn't so much that their By-Laws address the issue, it is more of a practice that each individual Board has just accepted as standard operating procedure.

Haugen commented that South Dakota also has the uniqueness of having a seated member from the South Dakota State Transportation Commission on their Board. He explained that this is a body, at the State level, that advises and helps select plans and programs of projects in South Dakota, and they are appointed by the Governor to serve on this Commission, and each MPO has one sitting member, and they are not typically people that serve as staff for any particular transportation agency or any individual government, but are people that the Governor has felt appropriate to appoint to represent their area.

Powers asked if Mr. Haugen had ever been to a St. Cloud MPO meeting. Haugen responded that he has not. Powers pointed out that they have 43 members on their Board. Haugen commented that they do have an Executive Committee that serves more on a month-to-month basis and the full body meets less frequently.

Vein opened the floor for discussion.

DeMers thanked staff for putting this information together. He stated that he feels he voiced his objections and perspective concerning this at our last meeting, but one thing he would add is, at some point, having discussed Grand Forks' perspective on having a staff person sit on the Board, and he understands and is empathetic with your situation, but at some level he would be willing to say "let people self-determine what they want for membership, and if this is the route the Grand Forks Planning Board wants to go, although he would object to it, he doesn't want to overstep his bounds and that is for them to decide."

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Vein commented that, as he was looking at this, he thinks the idea is that we want the best or ideal group of people to make the best decisions on behalf of both communities, and who that is or what that should look like, whether you are elected or not, may be positive, or maybe not so positive, he doesn't know, but he is just looking at what our purpose is, and what our function is and the important thing is that we have good people around this table that can make good decisions on behalf of our communities; and how that looks he isn't sure he can completely define it, but we have identified, of course, the bodies that need to be represented, the City Councils, the County Commission, the Planning and Zoning Commissions, etc., and we just have to make sure we use the people appropriately and that we come up with good decisions.

Grasser stated that, just a comment from his perspective; and maybe what he hopes to bring to the committee, and maybe interpreting, again for Planning and Zoning, but he thinks the Planning and Zoning Commission sees the value of having that technical component, within the planning, because the lines between planning and implementation is getting more blurred. He added that, for instance, you can't do land use planning without also incorporating, at least on the Grand Forks side, stormwater ponds, it's been a huge impact on their costs and developments, an unfunded federal mandate type of thing, but that type of thing has that technical component to it that may not otherwise quite be available. He said that the other thing he sees is the planning component of an MPO has changed over the years, there is more of an emphasis, it seems like, for measuring for a desire to see about basically measuring how did our planning goals/objectives get incorporated into actual construction activities; and an issue that pops up a lot is implementability.

Grasser commented that this his thought is that we are working a little bit more towards impacting operations so he thinks it valuable to have the operation input here. He added that he knows there can be an argument that, yes, he can be in the audience and do a lot of those types of things, but having been on both sides it makes a lot of difference as to how you can approach issues being on the board and having it as a more discussion item as opposed to bringing it up from the audience, which tends to automatically maybe have more of a confrontational, for lack of a better discussion, type of a purview to it.

Grasser stated that he hopes, and he thinks we see a lot more positive collaboration between the two communities; with the wastewater connect being the latest example, and he hopes they can move towards that new or better model of not getting hung up on some of the other things that have been a problem in the past; so he hopes he can bring some of that technical perspective here for consideration that might not otherwise be brought up.

Vein asked if we wanted to make a change we would probably change our by-laws, so that would be the thing that we would be doing, so unless we have a request to change our by-laws we would continue to operate as we currently are; and so this issue was brought forward, as it rightfully can or should be brought forward, and we had good discussion, so now we need to make a decision as to whether or not we want to implement a change or not, otherwise it stays as it is, correct. He added that he knows there was a lot of discussion about potential intent from the past, but what we have before us are the actual by-laws, that as far as he knows we are in compliance with, so the question is do we want to make any changes or not.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Vein commented that really, Mr. Grasser, as much as you talk about yourself and your position, it isn't really about that, it is about the by-laws and if we would change them to allow a non-voting member from that body, or another body, to be able to represent that body if that body, in fact, has recommended that they put that person on the board, so to him it is more specific, it isn't about an individual.

Vetter stated that in the time that he has been on the MPO Policy Board, he has been very surprised that we do, we look at issues not necessarily based on borders, we are looking at issues based on the entire community, without borders in mind; so he has been impressed with that during his time on this board, and he would gather that past MPO Boards probably weren't doing that and that is where this discussion probably came up, so as long as we move forward with the idea that we are looking at our entire community, and not getting into a "that's not going to work for Grand Forks, or that's not going to work for East Grand Forks", then he is okay moving forward, but when we start getting into those types of discussion where we are looking at a broad spectrum of things and someone comes in and says that they don't think that is going to work with my department, then he is going to have a problem as we need to look at solutions for the entire community, and as long as we are doing that then he doesn't have a problem.

Vein said that he does think, just to editorialize this a little bit, that with the meeting we had last week between the two cities, and talking about the interconnect, and potentially water and some of those things, he is hoping and he is feeling that we are working together maybe better than we have in the past, and today he feels good to be a part of this body, and with the other things we have done because we look at things way differently.

Malm asked for clarification on what exactly we are doing today. Vein responded that the question had been brought forward about Mr. Grasser being on this board as he is no longer a voting member on the Grand Forks Planning Commission, whom he is representing, and whether or not we want to change our by-laws as it appears they may not allow this, but it appears to him that the by-laws are actually neutral on this issue, so the real question is do we feel that we need to make changes to our by-laws to better clarify this or just move on and leave things just as they are.

Haugen stated that he would ask for clarity on the proxy. He explained that this is where this issue has really been in play for the last twenty-years, when people have said they can't attend we encourage them to send a proxy, and in the past we have always said that a proxy needs to be someone from the agency you represent, and so we impressed upon them that if they are going to send someone in their place that that person be from their agency. He asked if that is still what we are interpreting in the by-laws.

Vein asked if anyone has sent a proxy in recent years. DeMers responded that he was just going to ask if there is even a need for anyone to send a proxy. Vein agreed that he would ask this as well. Haugen responded that Mr. Strandell isn't here today, but he has probably been the one that sent a proxy most recently in the last couple of years.

Discussion on proxy attendance over the years ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Vein commented that he isn't seeing an issue with proxies either, so unless there is any further discussion he is going to move on to the next item.

MATTER OF FY2018 WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that we do a two-year work program, our current one covers FY2017 and FY2018. He stated that as we finish up our FY2017 we look at what we have in our FY2018 program.

Haugen stated that included in the packet is the summary of the activities that we had identified a year ago that we would be trying to accomplish in FY2018.

Haugen commented that this year we have a little bonus that we can tap into if we wish. He explained that this is due to the fact that the consolidated planning grant distribution formula that we discussed previously has still not been resolved, thus North Dakota did not tap into the FY2017 grant yet, and our funding that was supposed to come from the FY2017 grant was instead funded from the FY2014 dollars that were deobligated. He said that this means that we now have the unspent FY2017 dollars that we did not program for work activities now available and we are estimating that to be around \$250,000.

Haugen stated that this now means that we aren't just looking at, and reaffirming the FY2018 projects, we are asking if there are any other activities that either City might want us to undertake in addition to those already programmed.

Haugen reported that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting we noted that on the Minnesota FHWA side the other MPOs in Minnesota are doing ADA Transition Plans so that Federal Highway will allow projects that are programmed to move forward and get done, so that is one of the things we identified at the Technical Advisory Committee, and he believes that East Grand Forks staff are going to be suggesting to their City Council that they ask us to do an ADA Transition Plan for East Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that other activities that have been identified is, our video capturing, there are more and more signals being installed, there is an update to the signal system being done, so we want to make that a continuing program and we want to evaluate how we can extend this into the East Grand Forks signal system as well.

Vein said that you are asking if there are any additional projects that we might want to be programming and/or planning for in FY2018. Haugen responded that he is soliciting for a list of activities. He added that, just as we have done in the past, we have asked that that list of activities that each City might want us to do be vetted through their approval process and submitted to the MPO for consideration. He said that in order to really access the FY2017 funds our budget needs to increase the local match as well, so that would mean that it is not free dollars, it means that there are additional dollars that would have to be plugged into the work plan, and the respective City would need to come up with their portion of the local match.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Haugen explained that typically our funding split is 80% federal dollars, 10% Grand Forks Local Match, 9% East Grand Forks Local Match, and 1% MnDOT Local Match. He added that the last time we had a major revenue increase we worked with the individual cities and the State of North Dakota to come up with some match dollars to help as well, so there were instances where the 80/10/9/1 split was not used, but rather an 80/20 split was used with one local agency taking up the local match.

Vein asked if Mr. Haugen was asking for potential specific projects that we might want to look at because one of the thoughts he has had was a dedicated pedestrian walkway between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, possibly near the downtown area because that would benefit both communities and would be something we could study. Haugen responded that he thinks we did a very similar study when the greenway plan was first being developed and locations for four bridges were identified, and one of the four locations was a downtown location, so we can resurrect that study and use it as a framework and then focus on a location most likely between the Sorlie and the Kennedy Bridges. Vein said that this is just one thought he had.

Grasser commented that we are in the midst of a Long Range Transportation Plan update, and these large studies, as any study or any project has a habit of things popping up during the course of the study that we need to find money for, so he thinks we might want to reserve some of this money so it can be added back to the Long Range Transportation Plan so that when things pop up, and sometimes this has happened in the past and we don't have the budget to cover it, so we may want to pad some contingencies in that project.

Grasser said that another comment, more for the East Grand Forks partners, would be that the video detection for vehicle counts and things he thinks has been pretty valuable, so he thinks it would be worth pursuing if you can get a federal subsidy to do it.

Vetter commented that he doesn't know if Mr. Murphy has contacted Mr. Haugen yet, but in their discussion about another bridge on the southend, everyone focuses on 13th, 17th, 32nd, 40 something; it was felt that maybe we need to do a study to say that it is too expensive to put a bridge in at, say 17th, so we won't look at 17th anymore, lets concentrate on looking at each corridor to determine if it is even feasible to build a bridge there, and the potential cost of building this one versus that one, so he may be coming to you to see if that is something the MPO can do. Haugen responded that it is something that we can do, our current Street and Highway Plan didn't anticipate reopening up the location discussions, but it is something that we obviously wrestled with after the flood, so we have a lot of information on those locations; a lot of minutes and other discussion of the pros and cons for them.

Powers asked if Mr. Vetter was asking that we rank each location. Vetter responded that they are. He added that he thinks Mr. Murphy has already talked to Brad Bail, EGF Consulting Engineer, and that was why he encouraged him to go to reach out to the MPO because that is more of an MPO study than having East Grand Forks picking up the entire cost of it, so he will encourage him to talk to Mr. Haugen again.

Vein commented that the thing that surprised him about the meeting was that they talked about having the Cities get together to do that, there wasn't even a discussion on the MPO, but the only thing is that it has to come back to the MPO at some point in time in any event, but originally the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Cities were going to get together and start this discussion, that was his what he took away from that meeting, which was a little out of sequence from how we typically do it.

Haugen commented that the sooner the better, from his perspective because this would likely add time. He explained that we have an end date of December 2018 to have a Transportation Plan decision, and this would add time, material, staffing, and analysis, so the sooner we make a decision the better so we can meet that December deadline, which seems to be a fairly concrete deadline.

Vein stated that, again, what he heard is that the two Mayors are supportive of this, and members of the councils were both supportive of it, and he doesn't think there is any question of the members of that committee supporting doing something like this so he thinks we should tackle how we would make that happen because it seems like the MPO is the route that would have to be if it is going to be a part of our transportation plan; when you transition from whatever group there is to the MPO he isn't sure, but he thinks we would probably have both administrators working on that coordination. He added that this is a worthwhile project that might fall into this funding opportunity we have.

Mock asked if this is something that needs to come back through each City Council for support in order for us to get it included in the plan, or is that something we can do here. Haugen responded that there is, again, the issue of more local match being required. Mock said, then, that it should probably go through the City Councils. Haugen agreed, adding that it should in order to get an agreement that they are willing to provide the extra dollars.

Vein commented that again, the MPO wasn't originally mentioned, and he thinks it has to go that route. He added that it would seem like between now and the next meeting we should get that figured out, how it would come back, because he feels it is a very legitimate project to be a part of this, and if it needs to go back to our City Councils and then come to us we can do that, so if you want to talk to both City Administrators that would be good so we can figure out how to move it forward.

Grasser stated that he thinks it makes sense that the councils talked about moving the bridge idea forward, but at some point you are going to need to have some sort of data as questions will come up, so he thinks we need to do both, he thinks that both things happen at the same time. He said that we are talking about generating the data that would help, but he thinks that the basic idea of the interconnect, person to person and group to group still needs to happen, so he thinks you do both.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that the first public open house was held at the end of August at the Empire Art Center, with approximately 25 people attending. He added that they also launched our Wiki Mapping Tool. He said that he included a screenshot of it in the packet, and said that they have been getting a lot of hits on it these past few weeks.

Haugen stated that he also did a couple presentations to some local bodies. He referred to slides illustrating what he presented to the Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission, reminding

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

them that we have been on a multi-year journey to get to this point, where we are working on the Street and Highway Plan, reminding them that we did work with their Land Use Plans in order to assist us with our Street and Highway Plan.

Haugen commented that he also tried to explain that the major difference between the current 2040 plan and the 2045 plan is that we were focusing on state of good repair, but really didn't have a definition for that, and now we have identified targets to help define "state of good repair".

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side the federal funding has increased rather significantly; going from \$560,000 every fourth year in the 2040 plan to \$850,000 every fourth year in the 2045 plan. He said, however, that he did send a couple of additional slides that illustrate the opposite for North Dakota. He explained that a year ago at this time we were announcing soliciting for projects, and because of the FAST-ACT the dollars that we were considering would be Urban Program had increased substantially, so we were trying to back-fill projects or in 2021 identify a project that was able to use more of the dollars that were available, but last Friday the NDDOT asked the MPOs and the twelve urban cities to visit with them about an initiative that they are formulating called the "North Dakota Main Street Initiative".

Haugen reported that the major thing that this initiative will have is that all of the monies to fund this initiative would come from the Urban Program, so as he noted, what we show as being available to us will likely be cut in half, as it is currently conceptualized. He added that this also means that projects that we have in 2019 and 2020 will have to be reprogramed, they are no longer guaranteed having federal funds being obligated to them to the amount our current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. identifies.

Haugen commented that North Dakota Main Street is trying to focus on transportation choices, transportation that is revitalizing urban cores or areas that a transportation project would benefit and spur more revitalization in that area. He said that initially the program was focused on the Central Business Districts, but during the discussion at the meeting they did talk about that there probably are likely other areas of the urban cities that this program could benefit.

Haugen stated that this could cause a significant impact on our dollars, but then we also might have the opportunity to put in transportation that has a lot of amenities that the public has been wanting, but for financial reasons we haven't been able to deliver; so our project could be refocused instead of just delivering something that is mainly focused on vehicle transportation, it could be delivering projects that are really providing a transportation choice.

Haugen said that the NDDOT is on a pretty aggressive schedule to implement this initiative and have asked the twelve cities and the three MPOs to provide them comments on it. He added that there are still more questions than they have been able to answer yet. He stated that one of our comments was do we really have to target just this one small part of their federal aid program and raid it so heavily to implement this Main Street Program.

Vein commented that he is assuming Governor Bergum is pursuing this initiative. Haugen responded that he was, he added that there are some limitations the DOT can provide because federal strings are attached to DOT dollars, but they had the Department of Commerce there,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

they had Park and Rec there, so they are trying to partner up with other State agencies to deliver some of these concepts that the Governor has a keen eye for.

Vein said, then, that it is established that this is going to happen, it isn't just out for comment, the Governor is making the decision and all twelve cities are going to have to make modifications to accommodate this direction. Earl commented that it is going to take a major effort to not have this happen, if there is very strong push-back from the twelve cities and the three MPOs, and it could be modified, but he thinks Mr. Vein is right that there is going to be some initiative focused on the revitalization of built-up areas rather than new roadways and expanding corporate boundaries.

Vein commented that we do have DeMers Avenue, we can do a lot of street work downtown, there is no question, it might not have been the priority we had, but there are things that could be rolled into this. Haugen agreed, adding that, back to the funding piece, NDDOT's Urban Program is better described as part of it is on their State Highway System, which is the Regional Program, and the other part is on the Local Streets. He said that the money that they wanted to attach to this is just on the local side, and the DeMers Avenue project is a State Highway, so they might be beefing up their highway system using local dollars that otherwise we would use on the local side.

Grasser reported that he wasn't necessarily planning on doing a presentation to the City Council Work Session on this, comments are due next Friday, and he can read in a number of reasons for that, but there are so many unknowns right now, and Mr. Haugen basically picked up everything that we have a fairly high percentage of thinking we know. He added that he is really reluctant to really present, because he thinks that from the Grand Forks side his thought right now is that we will provide more technical questions and comments and things, funding is certainly going to be one of them because he is uncomfortable with it and it would be something that the City Council will ask about, so until they have a few more answers as to how this program is going to work he is reluctant to bring this too far through the community. He said that it feels like a hand grenade that we kind of throw into the room, and we aren't too sure what is going to happen when it blows up, so just so you know, as of today he isn't really planning on bring it forward.

Grasser commented that speaking of the downtown he can certainly see a scenario, perhaps that the main road will be funded with regional funds, which aren't being touched or impacted by this, but at some point, if you remember the DOT said there might be a level of enhancements that go beyond what they would pay for, and he can certainly see this program would kind of dove-tail into whatever we identify that might be. He stated, again, that the timeline implementing this thing might be difficult, all those things will need public input and discussion, so he is just kind of painting a picture of the lack of information that we have right now, and saying that it may be difficult to try to figure out and to comment to the City Council about it.

MATTER OF SAFETY PERFORMANCE STATE TARGETS

Haugen reported that one of the things we have to achieve in our next transportation plan is identification of specific targets, and they have identified, at the national level, some specific targets that we have to consider.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Haugen commented that the first set of targets that are now coming due, that we need to make a decision on, deal with safety. He stated that there are five specific areas: 1) Number of fatalities; 2) Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT); 3) Number of serious injuries; 4) Rate of serious injuries per million VMT; and 5) Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

Haugen said that, if you recall, we have the option of adopting the State Level Targets. He explained that if we adopt the State Level Targets on one side of our Bi-State, our only option is to adopt them on the other side as well.

Haugen stated that both States work with the MPOs and provide us some of the analysis and thoughts going into their ultimate decision, which they announced last month. He commented that North Dakota was still in a range perspective back then, while Minnesota has been in performance management for ten plus years, so they are a little more comfortable with what their numbers were.

Haugen referred to a slide illustrating both North Dakota and Minnesota numbers and stated that these are the final numbers that we received at the end of August, he then went over the information briefly.

Haugen reported that we now have 180 days as an MPO to make a decision. He stated that, again, if we go with each State we would have a total of 10 targets that we would be monitoring and assisting the State's on achieving; or we have the option of adopting MPO specific targets, which would mean we would have a minimum of five targets that cover the MPO area.

Haugen commented that as part of our work with our consultant on the 2045 plan, these are some of issues they are contractually obligated to assist us in understanding the advantages and disadvantages of which way to go.

Haugen cited an example of seven targets and went over the information briefly.

DeMers asked what the timeline is for the targets. Haugen responded that they are five-year rolling averages. DeMers said, then, that it would start in 2018 to 2023, or would we go backwards. Haugen responded that we would go backwards to establish the first target. He explained that the recording of the first performance is two year away, 2020, and so the first impact federal highway would impose on whether we are meeting or not meeting this target would be in 2021, and this is an annual exercise that the State DOTs and MPOs have to go through to see how each year we are achieving progress towards targets and to see if want to modify or change those targets.

DeMers asked if we are allowed to adopt targets that are below targets that Minnesota set up. Haugen responded that we are allowed. He added that we obviously continue our working relationship with both States and they are engaged in that decision making process, and as long as we can show strong rationale for why we might be adopting targets that are, maybe more aggressive than theirs, or more relaxed, as long as we are engaged in the cooperative process, it should be okay to accomplish.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, September 20th, 2017**

Vein said that this is due by February, so are you still having to do some more research going back, and would you come back with a recommendation for us, and when would you be ready to bring this forward. Haugen responded that he thinks it will take the full 180 days we are allotted, so we will most likely be making a final decision in February, however he will keep this body informed, most likely an update will be given in January, telling you what our current thoughts are, and let you digest it for a while and then make a decision in February.

Haugen reported that as they work with the States to establish these targets, they are informing us what our data is telling us. He said that the data is being reported, collected, and it is probably not too much of us having to go back and dig-up data, it is just asking for the data that they have readily available to them. Vein stated that they should know what data we need anyway won't they. Haugen responded that they will. Vein said, then that we should be getting that data. Haugen commented that we actually have the data, he just isn't sharing it with you because it might steer you in a certain way, and they want us to understand, and take the 180 days to understand how this affects not just the safety performance measures, but again we will be starting to work on the other performance measures with our State DOT's.

DeMers asked what the numbers are on the bottom, below each target. Haugen responded that the actual target is this number, so on the Minnesota side their target is to have, in 2018, 375 fatalities. He said that this is a rate of .62 fatalities per 100,000,000 vehicle miles traveled. He added that you can see that more vehicle miles traveled in Minnesota suppresses the rate. He said that this is the same with the serious injury rate, but added that these are the actual number of crashes, and unfortunately the number of people that died on our roadways. DeMers asked if 3% is a 375 reduction. Haugen responded that it would be a 3% reduction from the five year rolling average of fatalities on the Minnesota side.

Vein said, then, that they do use a rolling average too so you could have four bad years and steadily get better and still not be able to show, so it seems interesting, the methodology of each crash.

Grasser commented that, again, it is something to think of that with the variability we have locally, and as an example, high crash intersections, we go through that and we report every single year and there are years when an intersection is in it for two years and then it drops off and a different one comes in so variability concerns him. He said that he is also wondering what media headlines might be when we debate at an individual council level how many fatalities we are going to support on a local level.

Vein stated that the difference would be, if your target is 3%, and if you are safe maybe we only have 1% fatality, but then they are also asking for a 5% decline; so if you are at 10% and you have a 5% decline that is reasonable but if you are a 1% and you are looking at a 5% decline, probably won't happen.

Grasser said that he thinks that percentages will be a different discussion, and if you have to say we are willing accept 16 fatalities a year, that discussion will be hard.

MATTER OF NEAR SOUTHSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD STUDY WALKABILITY SURVEY

Haugen reported that this is just reporting on the Near Southside Neighborhood Study. He said that you approved an amendment to the Scope of Work to add this Walkability Survey, and this is just to let you know that it was done on September 7th.

Haugen commented that they used a national survey form and our Safe Routes to School maps as the areas that we split up the neighborhood into teams. He said that they had seven volunteers from the neighborhood show up and were able to cover four of the six areas.

Haugen stated that the teams walked the perimeter of the areas they were given, and made notes of what was good and what was bad in their areas, and staff is now putting together those individual reports.

Haugen explained that the survey itself, it asked people to rank each of these individual questions, and then they are added up to come up with how the neighborhood stacked up. He said that it is far from perfect, but it is pretty darn good, and all four teams came up with this conclusion.

Vein asked if the report would be ready before the next MPO meeting. Haugen responded that a draft would be available between the next cycle of meetings, between the Technical Advisory Committee and this body, but as part of the overall neighborhood study, it won't be final at that time.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

- b. Bill Listing For 8/16/17 to 9/15/17 Period

Haugen reported that you asked for the MPO bill listings, this is a list of the bills we had during the August 16, 2017 to September 15, 2017 period.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 20TH, 2017, 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**

**Wednesday, October 18th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the October 18th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent were: Jeannie Mock and Al Grasser.

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

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 20TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 20TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Kimley-Horn

Haugen referred to a slide presentation and reported that included in the staff report, which he is showing, are three different topics that we will try to address today.

Haugen stated that the first topic for discussion is a presentation that our consultants, Kimley-Horn, presented to the Technical Advisory Committee last week. He said that a copy of the presentation was included in the packet for your review.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

Haugen stated that, just to recap, they held their first public meeting at the Empire Arts Center at the end of August, and the next one is scheduled to occur in November, sometime before Thanksgiving.

Haugen reported that they had around twenty-two people attending, or signed-in. He referred to a slide that illustrated the demographic information from that meeting; including sex, disability, age, race, language spoken, income, and where they heard about the meeting.

Haugen commented that we do have our on-line mapping tool up and running, and stated that the next slide is a snapshot of what data they have received via that tool. He pointed out that you can see that they have had 61 individuals complete the demographic survey, and have received 145 comments on different areas in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and there is the ability to converse back and forth with some of the comments being made.

Haugen stated that this on-line mapping tool will be available until the end of October and, again they are using it as a way to help identify what issues should be looked at.

Haugen reported that at our next Technical Advisory Committee meeting we will be spending a considerable amount of time going over our goals and objectives, most of which will be based on the performance measures, and we will also begin discussion on targets as well.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it is just giving you a snapshot; and on the left side are the ten goals/statements that we have in our Long Range Transportation Plan, on the top are the federal goals that they are trying to achieve with the specific performance measures that they are making us do, so we are showing how our goals fit with those federal performance measures.

Haugen stated that this identifies within, again, those ten goals in terms of what measures we identified. He said that on the far right you will see that we have a different number of measures to reach the goals. He added that some of these measures are ones that are in our current 2020 plan and we need to decide if we want to carry them over into the 2045 plan as well. He explained that the current ones we have were done at the insistence of our Federal Partners prior to the Feds telling us what their performance measure requirements will be so we have identified the we will have to consider adding some of the federal requirements in addition to the ones we have.

Haugen commented that we are trying to build a foundation as to what the different definitions of things are. He pointed out that a goal is not a performance measure, and a performance measure is not a goal, that is the big take away here. He stated that a performance measure is something that you use to gage how you achieve your goals and a target is what you are specifically trying to achieve with the goal.

Haugen stated that he thinks we do have the requirements available to, at a minimum, address the performance measures that the Feds set for us to do. He added that we have to have close coordination with both States, and how they set their targets so that when we consider setting our targets, we have a good grasp of what is going on. He said that the important thing is that the Feds do not define what the targets will be, but they do tell us what the measures are and what

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

data we should be using, or if we want we can ask them for acceptance of equitable data, but they do give us requested data

Haugen reported that one of the struggles that is taking place is that these federal measures are very short term, and of course we are adopting a long range transportation plan, so trying to fit how these short term measures can work with a long term vision that we are trying to achieve is difficult. He added that there is no State Statute in either state about performance based planning so it is directly a federal policy that we are trying to include.

Haugen stated that ultimately what they are trying to achieve is to develop a report that we have to produce for the federal requirements, and to make it as simplistic as possible yet give people a sense of how we are progressing towards those targets we identified.

Haugen commented that the next couple of slides discuss safety targets. He stated that both States have adopted their safety targets for next year. He pointed out that the table shows how our data compares to their data. He added that in February we have to make a decision on whether we want to identify our own targets or go with the State targets.

Haugen reported that the good news is that locally we have very few fatalities, and also relatively few serious injuries. He stated that at a local level we aren't being asked to adopt a local number for the North Dakota side and a local number for the Minnesota side, we are being asked to adopt a local number that covers the whole metro area so the next iteration of these will be showing just the MPO statistics.

TDM 2015 Base

Haugen commented that the next topic is just to update you on our Travel Demand Model. He explained that we use this to give us some sense of where our future hot spots might be, as far as congestion, and if we do this type of project at this location how will it affect our traffic patterns.

Haugen stated that the first thing we do is to make sure that we have a model that is calibrated and validated to base year observations, with 2015 being the base year. He referred to the full report that A.T.A.C. has produced, included in the packet, and went over it briefly, focusing on places where we are showing we have fairly good model results versus observed results.

Red River Bridge Study

Haugen stated that the next topic is just a bit of information based on discussion the two Cities had last month about future river crossings. He said that the way this is being set up at this point in time, and in talking with both City Administrators as to how to proceed, is to first try to identify a scope of work that covers what we really want to be looking at, and how much past locations do we want to bring forward to today.

Haugen commented that what he has put together is, in this package you will see a lot of past work we have done, and we can do similar work, but he want to make sure that from the State and Federal perspective that they are still allowing us to do this type of work as some rules have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

changed since this work was done in 1999, 2000, and 2001; so he is trying to make sure that before we get too far down the road we know whether it is an eligible cost or not.

Haugen stated that we will be holding a special Technical Advisory Committee meeting, most likely it will be held two Wednesday's from now, so that they can also go through this information.

Haugen commented that one of the first basic questions is how many locations are we going to bring back to the table. He stated that at one point we had narrowed down potential locations to six after having looked at probably a dozen locations. He said that some you are not seeing here are all Grand Forks City Street referenced – 8th Avenue South, 13th Avenue South, 62nd Avenue South, Realignment of the Point Bridge (a true 4th Avenue Bridge instead of the Point Bridge), so we are asking the Technical Advisory Committee for assistance on, because of other development that has occurred since the flood protection system was put into place, whether we want to look at some of these locations further to determine if they are still feasible.

Haugen referred to information on the proposed sites included in the packet, and went over the various development/changes for each briefly.

Haugen pointed out that when you look at the 17th Avenue South location you can see that the bike/ped bridge has gone in place where the initial straight line shot assumption or direction was at that time. He added that the development in East Grand Forks at this location does not allow a straight shot anymore, a direct connection to Rhinehart Drive or Bygland Road, so part of the question would be do we still think 17th Avenue South is still feasible at a reasonable cost.

Haugen stated that another decision or recommendation we will try to get from the Technical Advisory Committee is, this drawing shows the profile that penetrates the dike system. He said that we do have other alternatives that we did develop profiles that showed any future bridge being high and dry, so the difference is when we look at the 17th Avenue crossing, this alternative analysis that shows the change in volumes and the change in traffic use. He added that it also has a cost estimate, so the high and dry one would typically double the cost of one that penetrates the dike system, so 15 or 17 years ago, one of the early decisions was that these additional bridges would be ones that would penetrate the dike system and we based the cost estimates on that.

DeMers asked if Alternative 1 is the one that goes through the dike and Alternative 2 is the one that is high and dry, or vice versa. Haugen responded that Alternative 2 is the one that goes through the dike and Alternative 1 is the one that is high and dry. He added that Alternative 1's cost estimate is \$30,000,000 so you have a lot longer bridge span, so it is more expensive.

Haugen referred to a slide and commented that this just gives an example of, from our Travel Demand Model, if we did a bridge at these different locations, how they would impact the three existing bridges. He added that the reason Merrifield is included in all of these scenarios, is because back then the decision was that the Merrifield Bridge would be the recommended project out of the transportation plan, and the only discussion was then that if a second bridge

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

should be located and where it should be, so all our analysis included Merrifield as part of the base decision making.

Haugen pointed out that the base-line shows four bridges; the three existing ones and then as you add a bridge at 17th Avenue South, does it change the Kennedy Bridge much, no; does it have an impact on the Sorlie, yes; and does it have an impact on the Point Bridge, yes, considerable.

Haugen said that, just to explain a little bit about Elks and 25th Avenue South; 24th Avenue South, of course (referring back to the aerial photo) would be where we have continuous east/west roadway, and we would try to locate a bridge where there is continuity, but once we started getting into the modeling at that time, the reaction was that that loads traffic up on those corridors considerably, so then the thought was that maybe if we had a river crossing that would connect with the through street on the other side, then people would have to decide to turn left or right on the North Dakota side, how that would impact traffic, so that is how it got to Elks and 25th, it forced people to make a decision to go right or left instead of carrying traffic all the way through at that location. He added that the other benefit was that when the flood protection system was still being designed, Elks was the only location that had an opening as part of the design, and we were trying to minimize the number of openings in the dike system.

DeMers asked, then, if these are for 2020 put together in 2002. He asked how they accounted for growth outside of just traffic because, obviously, if you put a bridge somewhere it is going to affect where development will occur, is that part of that model. Haugen responded that it is part of the model. He added that at that time, with the flood recovery, we were working on six different types of growth scenarios, and how these future crossings impacted those growth scenarios. He said that this last go around we just updated both Cities Land Use Plans, and in Grand Forks there was a lot of discussion about whether their land use plan change, particularly with or without a 47th Avenue Interchange, but future river crossings weren't discussed much; but on the East Grand Forks side there was a lot of discussion as to whether or not a future bridge would change their plan, but he doesn't believe that in the end their Land Use Plan changed because of whether there would be a bridge or not, it was just trying to account for where one might be located and how the City would grow around it.

Haugen commented that the last bit of information in the packet specifically addresses the Merrifield Bridge, and again we can go to this level of analysis more deeply if we have more focused locations. He stated that cost-wise it is a little bit prohibitive if we are still looking at six locations to do this type of analysis, but he included an example of an early agreement of Merrifield being a location, so we should look further into this to make sure it is a good location, and it gives us a good return on our investment. He referred to a slide illustrating an example of the benefit/cost analysis that was done. He pointed out that it shows that it is 2.2 ratio of benefit over cost, so it is a pretty good transportation facility to install.

Haugen summarized that this is the approach we are trying to take; first we are trying to make sure that our State and Federal partners are comfortable with the level of analysis we have done in the past, so before we do down that road we know whether or not this is something we can finance. He stated that if we find out that they have changed the rules and we cannot do these

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

things, then it will revert back to both Cities and Counties to see if they want to have an analysis done and if they are willing to put their own dollars in to pay for it.

DeMers asked if Mr. Haugen could remind him of the I-29 Corridor Study, did it suggest anything at 62nd Avenue for an interchange. Haugen responded that it was looked at but in the end it said that a 62nd Avenue Interchange really did not provide much bang for the buck. DeMers stated that, with that, he agrees that it seems like taking a limited study approach is the best model, and it appears that Merrifield is a consensus of where a by-pass would be, so it doesn't make sense to include 62nd in it, or any type of additional local bridge to him, because he thinks we would get into the same type of problem we right now where we have all of our bridges within a mile each other. He said that he would still look at 32nd and 47th, and keep Merrifield in there, then we would only be looking at three locations. He added that we should also look at two different types of bridges; you look at one as more of a high capacity, and then build the Merrifield as your flood plan accessible bridge, and then potentially a 47th or 32nd as a low volume, local bridge that is closed during flood events.

Vein commented that it seems like he is hearing that we should study at some level, he doesn't think it is a reconnaissance level, which is really a high high level to find if you have really studied things which are obviously not going to work and then narrow it down to some level that may be. He stated that the other issue, for him, is even if we wanted to do something, what is affordable, what can we get financed; are we going to be able to get federal cost share, what would it take to get federal funds to do a bridge, because he thinks without it he isn't sure they could even do one. Haugen responded that we have had this discussion in the past; the DeMers Avenue project that is coming up in Grand Forks in 2019, their traffic forecasts are showing that they can't meet the capacity demand with just a two-lane DeMers roadway, and so as part of the discussion they need to have to show that their investment is going to meet the future traffic is some level of commitment that they will try to extra capacity elsewhere to try to satisfy that river crossing. He added that there was a similar decision/discussion that took place when DeMers Avenue and Washington Street was reconstructed in the 1990's; again, because at that point there was not a future or additional river crossing, all that traffic had to go through that one point, and the project that was ultimately built there wasn't built to meet the level of service demand. He explained that the reason it was built that was because the State's and the Cities agreed that they would work to find a compatible bridge location; so, because two of the three existing river crossings are State Highways, those two in the future, based on our past travel demand models, would be at their capacity by the horizon year, therefore we need to try to find additional crossings, so therefore he is fairly comfortable knowing that the way federal things are today, that federal participation in a future river crossing is about as assured as any federal participation in any future project would be.

Vein stated that he thinks the difference is, there are two things; not just federal participation, but the availability of federal funds. He said that it is easy for them to say it would qualify, but if there isn't any money it's a matter of authorization verses appropriation, especially if competing nationally.

Vein asked what the next step is on this. Haugen responded that the next step is to hold the special Technical Advisory Committee meeting to see if we can't, from a technical point of view

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

of basically at high level what is constructible, or can be accomplished given the new layout of the land down here; to see if we can't get a scope of work or the locations that we will focus on and put effort into. He said that once that is done then we will come back to this body and both cities and counties to say that this is what the technicians are saying are sites that we should reexamine and bring up-to-date the information that we have of what those parameters would be and what the cost would be. He added that if we can all agree to just an "x" amount of river crossing sites, we will ask for a scope amendment with our current consultant, and through this process we will have a cost estimate of what it is to engage those experts to update the data, and we will also have whether it is all eligible for our dollars or if there is something that we can't pay for with our dollars, but it is something that is still wanted, if others are willing to bring dollars to the table to have that analysis done.

Haugen said that, to summarize, the next step is to try to get a scope of work of what to do and what to spend our money on, to try to get that as focused as possible so that it is the least costly as possible, within what our financial means are, and proceed from there. He added that we still have the deadline of December 2018 to have a new plan approved and adopted and presented to our State and Federal partners so this added work isn't in our current scope, will have to fit within that timeline.

Vein asked, when this first came up that there was a conversation between the two presidents of the City Councils, they didn't even talk about the MPO, and they were talking that they might somewhat coordinate themselves, are you talking to either of those entities, or the administrations on both sides of the river about what the MPO is doing and how this is more of specific forecast through the MPO then maybe what they assumed. Haugen responded that he has been communicating with both City Administrators, and he presented them that this is the plan of how the MPO is approaching this, and the piece that is still kind of up in the air is that interconnect group the appropriate group to be involved with this; we can work with that group but we have to realize, at least his understanding is, is if we go south, outside of the East Grand Forks flood protection system, we really need to engage Polk County because they are most likely the sponsor of a bridge outside the flood protection system on the East Grand Forks side. He added that obviously they are not part of the interconnect group as well. DeMers commented that what he thinks about the interconnect group is that it was never brought through the Council on the East Grand Forks side, so they don't have a mission for that or anything, so he would say that, without even having authority, it seems like it is outside the scope of what that group is supposed to be doing, it is supposed to be focused on that specific goal, and he would say that if you want another group, put another group together, but to him it seems out of their scope. Vein said that this is kind of what we are supposed to do. DeMers agreed, adding that we already have this group, and it has to come to us, so he thinks this is the right group to do this. Haugen responded that they are still struggling with how to engage that interconnect group, they are still in desire of, to have some engagement in this discussion, at least that is his understanding today, and so how he approached it was, just as we have steering committees when we do studies, we could use that interconnect group as kind of our steering committee, but we also have to make sure that, if we truly are going to discuss locations outside of the East Grand Forks flood protection, that we get the right governmental agency that would be the most likely local sponsor of that kind of structure involved. He stated that this becomes, again, kind of outside the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

interconnect group, so now we have Polk County represented, most likely, and does that mean that Grand Forks County wants to be at the table for discussion, and do we invite the whole Polk County Board, or is there just Commissioners representing the west side of Polk County DeMers commented that, like he said, this group is the one that already has all those players, so why don't we just use this group that is designed and structured and pointed all in that direction. Vein added that anyone can attend and be a part of it. Haugen responded that that is correct. Vein said that he just wanted to make sure that politically that is understood because it started at one location and kind of gravitated here, which is where he thought it would have to come anyway, and he wanted to make sure that we are all on the same page. Haugen responded that he is working through the City Administrators toward that and suggested that the Board members individually discuss this with their fellow governing body members.

DeMers said that on the travel demand model he noticed that all of the tests were done on the Grand Forks side, and he is wondering if there is any possibility that that would transfer over. Haugen responded that the screen lines were across limited access barriers. He said that besides the Red River the screen lines, because East Grand Forks has the Red Lake River, from the model perspective doesn't provide a good spot for a screen line. He explained that most of the screen lines we want to have a line that cuts across the complete metro area, so that is why, just on the screen line you see no East Grand Forks, but all the other measureables, the functional class, the volumes on the roadway, those all are metro-wide criteria that they were analyzing, so it is just the screen line and that is because the natural ones in East Grand Forks really don't carry across the whole metro area.

Haugen stated that this was really just for information and to let you know where we are going with the river crossing issue; if you had other direction that you wanted to provide for staff to follow, that is what this item was for. Strandell commented that, some background on this; he doesn't remember how many years ago it was but Polk County did protect, or dedicate and reserve some right-of-way for a Merrifield Bridge, and he would have to go back and research this more, but it was thought at that point that that was the next bridge. Haugen agreed, adding that staff went to both sides of the river and asked for a moratorium on development, and at the end of the Merrifield study, they were able to whittle down as to what the corridor would be looking like and to only reserve that corridor and free up a wider path that they did the moratorium on.

Malm asked, did anybody ever do anything, and he is just asking the question, do anything going north rather than to go south. Haugen responded that they did. He stated that they analyzed north locations; 27th Avenue North on the west side and 23rd St NW on the Minnesota side, and it was one of the future bridge locations in the 1980s or 1990s, but with the flood protection on the Minnesota side they redesigned the golf course, and that corridor seems to have lost some of its desirability and the golf course is now protected from that transportation investment, so if we looked at the next mile north for a river crossing, and he thinks you will see, at least from a modeling point of view, the further away you get from the existing bridges, the less impact you have on the existing bridges, and particularly as you go north, so it isn't really desirable to go north, nor is it desirable to go further to the south.

Information only.

MATTER OF T.I.P. PROJECT SOLICITATION

Haugen reported that there are two things here that are worth noting; the first one we talked about a little at our last meeting and that is the North Dakota Main Street Initiative. He explained that the way it has been conceptualized and presented to us has been that all of the money for that initiative will come from the Urban Road Program. He added that this is money that is focused on the twelve urban cities in North Dakota, of which each one gets an allocation or appropriation given to them each year, and this one shows that Grand Forks was getting about 2.5 million dollars, and it would inflate each year because FAST actually has more federal dollars flowing out of it, but the Main Street program is going to take the revenue and cut this source of funding in half.

Haugen commented that as part of the T.I.P. solicitation, normally we would be doing a new T.I.P. cycle and we would be releasing a letter of solicitation saying that this is the amount of money we anticipate being available, let us know what your project are; but this Main Street Initiative, as it is conceptualized, upsets that balance and that whole cycle, and we don't know how much money will be available in the future, and we also don't know how that program is going to impact the existing projects that are in the T.I.P. He added that there is a less likelihood that the 2018 project on 42nd Street in Grand Forks will be impacted, but it is more likely that the 2020 project on University Avenue will be.

Haugen said that the question is, if you have a current program project scoped out, sitting on a shelf ready to be implemented and then half the funding is cut, do you re-scope the project to fit the federal funds that are now available or do you retain the project as it is and add local dollars to it.

Haugen commented that we are kind of in this area where we are trying to get this T.I.P. program going, but the Main Street Initiative decision hasn't been announced, so we still have a lot of questions so we are proceeding forward on certain programs that we can, and those are included in the packet, but the Main Street issue is really holding up our most significant funding source and how it is going to impact what we do.

Haugen stated that NDDOT asked us for comments, and he included a copy of the letter he submitted in the packet. He pointed out that his letter focused on just how the fiscal impact is to us. He said that his reading of our federal requirements would state that this fiscal impact is so great that it jeopardizes the validation of our Long Range Transportation Plan because it upsets our fiscal constraint issue so much. He added that this trickles over to our Minnesota projects because everything is based off of our transportation plan and if our transportation plan is no longer good, then those projects that are programmed out of it are also in question.

Haugen commented that he did offer them what he thought was a way to work around that issue, and that is to leave the project that are already programmed in our T.I.P.s along, thus it doesn't question whether we have projects utilizing federal funds being consistent with our plan, and then not just us but the other two North Dakota MPOs are updating their transportation plans so that in a couple of years we can have all of our plans reacting to how this Main Street Initiative will impact them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

Haugen referred to the presentation, included in the packet, and explained that there are some other programs that are not affected by the Main Street Initiative. He went over them briefly.

Haugen summarized that we do have this issue hanging over our head as to what funding will be available for the Urban Roads Program, so we are holding off our formal solicitation of that. He said that they are announcing to your staff that they should expect that once that Main Street Initiative is decided they will receive a solicitation for those projects. He added that they are pushing the NDDOT to allow extended time to that so that the deadline is not in the Early part of December, but is pushed into the next year as much as possible because, depending on the decision, it might create the need for a lot of shuffling of things, particularly on the North Dakota side.

Vein asked if Fargo/Moorhead has similar concerns. Haugen responded that they have a concern, but it isn't as significant a concern to them. He explained that Fargo, in particular, has a sales tax that gives them more dollars. He added that their uniqueness is that they actually use some of their highway dollars to buy buses, so their Street and Highway financial constraint is not the same as it is to us. He stated that Bismarck/Mandan is more similar to us.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side, the Urban Roads Program is actually called the City Sub-Target, and 2022 is the last year of our T.I.P. cycle, and that is the year East Grand Forks is scheduled to get the sub-target funds, so if the roundabout on Bygland/Rhinehart isn't the project they will be doing, then they will have to come up with another one, and let us know by January.

Information only.

MATTER OF NORTH DAKOTA FREIGHT PLAN

Haugen reported that this is just to update you as to what North Dakota did with our recommendations, as far as identifying the Critical Freight Network and the North Dakota Strategic Freight Network.

Haugen stated that in order to access the new federal funds that were appropriated into the freight program, each State had to update their freight transportation plan. He said that North Dakota used that opportunity to identify these networks. He referred to a slide and explained that it is the one that shows our federally identified Critical Urban Freight segments. He stated that these roadway segments are now eligible for that money that is in the freight program and they did accept our recommended mileage and locations.

Haugen pointed out what was recommended for the North Dakota Strategic Freight Plan and said that it is very similar to the Critical Freight Network, except that it is expanded out to the whole MPO area and there is no separate State Freight Program that this will apply the funding to, but it does show the level of importance of these freight corridors in the Grand Forks area.

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side, Minnesota took the stance that they would solicit projects, identify projects that have the most merit, and those projects, then, would identify the corridors where those projects are located and those become the Critical Urban Freight Corridor.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

Haugen referred to the last couple of pages in the packet, and commented that these are the projects that are in the current program, the S.T.I.P. and T.I.P. He pointed out that the highlighted project is the one that is most likely going to get the first use of that freight program funding. He added that Grand Forks has some projects located at the end of the list that could be funded from the program, but this is just to inform you that it is moving forward and that they did accept our recommendations so now we have roadways that are eligible for this separate freight program, and there are about \$20,000,000 dollars each year statewide.

Information only.

MATTER OF TITLE VI REVIEW

Haugen reported that we are eligible to be audited for Title VI compliance every year. He stated that there is a pool, and this is for the North Dakota side only, of four entities; Fargo/Moorhead, Bismarck/Mandan, Minot, and us that can be picked to be audited through a random generator, and we were selected this last year. He added that we were also selected the prior year as well.

Haugen commented that we probably have the best Title VI program in the State after two audits in a row, but Ms. Kouba will walk you through the one item that we had to address per the audit. Kouba stated that in actuality this is kind of two items, two population data for groups that fall under our Title VI.

Kouba explained that the audit discovered that the numbers in our Limited English Proficiency and Environmental Justice documents needed to be updated.

Kouba reported that the LEP Plan basically looks at those who can't speak English very well, and explained that the previous numbers were from 2008-2012 American Community Survey (ACS) data and were replaced with the most current available, which are from 2011-2015 ACS data. She added that other than the updated numbers, there isn't any real change in the plan.

Kouba stated that the EJ Manual shows where low income and minority populations are located. She said that, again, the current numbers were from 2008-2012 ACS data and was updated with 2011-2015 ACS data. She added that the number of minority areas remained the same but one area changed location. She said that there were some new areas added to the EJ map as well, thus the number of low income areas increased from 7 block groups to 10 block groups.

DeMers asked if those tracks in the high concentration of low income populations are predetermined. Kouba responded that they are predetermined by the census. DeMers asked if each of those tracks is supposed to represent a certain number of people. Kouba responded that in our EJ Manual we have a set methodology where we look at the total population of the MPO area, and then whatever percentage that is, if these areas are three times that, or 50% of that area, then it is considered a minority area; and in the case of low income they look at a 50% level for the simple reason that by the time you get to three times the amount of the whole area, you are getting into like an 83% range. DeMers commented that he thinks of how these are configured it seems like the one in East Grand Forks covers a lot of space that doesn't have any people and he is just wondering how it was done. Haugen responded that if you think about the wards, and you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, October 18th, 2017**

have precincts in your wards, those are all tied into one; the census doesn't really do that with its tract systems, tracts and block groups. He said that they do try to have some parity but their aren't constrained as much as wards and so we don't show it, but actually there are block groups in Grand Forks that include Thompson. DeMers stated, then, that there is a possibility that in 2020 there will be a whole new set of tracks and block groups. Kouba responded that there is a possibility that that could occur. Haugen added that they try to carry them over as much as possible. DeMers asked if they change as population changes. Haugen responded that they do.

Kouba reported that those are the numbers they are using for low income population areas, and for the minority areas they only have two areas of high concentration in comparison to the three we previously had. She explained that one of those areas is the same as last time, the other two are not included this time. She pointed that she included a table that matches up with the map, as well as the methodology numbers they were looking at.

Kouba stated that the combined area would be considered are Environmental Justice areas, so it isn't just one or the other, it is all of them together.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE MAPS UPDATE, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstaining: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

b. Bill Listing For 9/16/17 to 10/13/17 Period

Haugen reported that you asked for the MPO bill listings, this is a list of the bills we had during the September 16, 2017 to October 13, 2017 period.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 18TH, 2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:06 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 15th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the November 15th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 18TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 18TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen referred to the agenda and stated that before we start he just wanted to clarify that Agenda Item 5b should state “Performance Management Discussion” instead of “Project Management Discussion”.

Kimley-Horn

Haugen referred to the packet, and commented that a copy of a slide presentation was included. He stated that he will just pick out some of the more pertinent slides. He added that staff is trying to keep the MPO Executive Policy Board, at your monthly meetings, informed as to where we are at in the process, and also to have you continue to think about some of these performance management issues as we move forward.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Haugen referred to a slide of the project timeline and explained that we are working on our goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets. He stated that this will actually extend now because we now have assurance as to when the feds are requiring their performance measures and targets to be set and both State DOTs will be going into next year to establish those, so this will be a continuing timeframe throughout out process that we will have to always think about performance measures at specific times, not just one and done.

Haugen reported that our wiki-mapping that we had has concluded. He pointed out that we had a total of 217 inputs into the system, and we categorized them as shown on the table.

Haugen stated that the next real big topic, after safety, will be pavement conditions and bridge conditions. He explained that all of our jurisdictions have a pavement management software system in place. He added that at one time we thought we did not have information on the NHS system for a portion of our system, but we do have that information, so we are going to start working with both State DOTs on performance for pavement. He said that bridge information is still yet to be released by both States yet.

Haugen commented that the next three slides talk about our going from the 2040 forecast to the 2045 forecast, and we are working off of what we think the future street network will be just to accommodate the housing and employment growth, so this gives you some very detailed idea of what roads will be put where.

Haugen stated that, to give you an idea, they updated both Cities Land Use Plans, and there has been a shift in both housing and employment. He pointed that the maps show where they have been shifted to and from. He went over the information on the maps briefly.

Performance Management Discussion

Haugen reported that there are two new goals statements, because the feds are asking us to look at two new things, included in your packet.

Resiliency

Haugen said that the first goal in the short-term is resiliency. He explained that what it is actually trying to do is to have us look at our transportation system, specifically the resiliency and the reliability and to reduce or mitigate storm water impacts, to try to keep the roads open.

Haugen commented that he included objectives that we are submitting to the Technical Advisory Committee, the MPO Executive Policy Board, and eventually the public. He added that under each objective we identify what standards we want to accomplish; and again, this is the structure of not just our transportation plan, but of both cities basic land use plans and other plans, and the structure of the whole statement with objectives and then with the standards that support the objectives.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Tourism

Haugen reported that the feds said that we should work toward enhancing travel and tourism as we do our future transportation system planning. He said that this is a fairly new goal so as you can see we have only drafted one objective to help us achieve this, along with a couple of standards to show that we are fulfilling our minimum federal requirement.

Vein asked to go back one slide and pointed out that it states “reduce street and highway system vulnerability to snow”. He asked what the options are for that. Haugen responded that some options would include things like living snow fences, etc. Vein asked if this is a type of urban verses rural sections, potentially too, then. Haugen responded that that would be correct. He added that it isn’t defined in the standards, it is more of what your design standards are currently providing, but if there are chronic places where you have snow build-up, to try new techniques like living snow fences and other things to try to capture the snow and have it pile somewhere other than the street, that is one example.

Grasser commented that they had a similar conversation at the Technical Advisory Committee, relative to this because we’ve got definite standards that we design to, especially on the Federal Highway System; they are very specific as to the design, amount of ponding, and all those different things, but now we need to do something higher than those standards because we need to reduce or improve, or do whatever; and part of the issue is do we not worry about it at the objectives level, but when it goes into the standards and measurements level, how much effort will be required because he thinks that it is going to be a policy decision at some point for this body as to how much do we want to push the process to minimize the support system we have to create at the local level; our demand, power and investment to be measurable, so we aren’t really at that yet. He added that he doesn’t know if we should get hung-up on the words at the objective level or wait farther on as to how they translate into actual measurables, but he thinks, again, as a group we will need to have that discussion, what streets does it apply to, how many measurables can we have that we are not already collecting, and who decides whether we’ve met an objective.

Vein commented that even if he looks at storm-sewer; he supposes it could mean you are going to increase your design event ten years or twenty years. He said that that is what is going to have to be done and there is going to be a cost involved; and he is thinking that is more capital costs, but some of the operational things you would do too because if you don’t have a living snow fence you will have to put up a temporary snow fence.

Mock stated that, when you talk about storm-water, she assumes you are talking about MS4 storm-water requirements, so they are talking about of whether it is a regional plan or site specific plan for storm-water requirements. Grasser said, again, that is the question he has, how do you redesign to a certain standard and have regulations that we have to meet; so if we say improve or reduce to make it better, how do we do that and how do we fund that, those are some of the questions we need to answer. He added that we want to maintain the local ability to interpret these things so we don’t get locked into something unexpected.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Haugen referred to the next slide; existing goals and performance measures, and stated that the feds required us to have performance measures in our 2040 plan even though they did not specify exactly what performance measures we had to have, so we have, here, identified both the ones where we do have performance measures and then we identified where we have to add in the federally required ones.

Haugen stated that our next discussion point is trying to, a lot of these federally required ones are really short-term annual, two-year, four-year measures, and we are trying to integrate them into our long range requirements, which are obviously 20+ years. He said that they are working off of, it all works in the planning process of what our goals, objectives, and standards are, so some of our performance measures will be short-term targets, and some will be how do we achieve that long term vision we are trying to do.

Haugen referred to a slide showing what each State has identified for the five required Safety targets, and said that you have seen these before, but you haven't seen that each State, for some targets, have a short-term, mid-term and long-term target. He stated that for many years now the long-term target has been "towards zero deaths"; so when you have a short-term, one-year target and you are talking about 138 fatalities, but the long-term vision is zero, this gives us some idea of how they hope to progress towards zero, with a mid-term target that, on the North Dakota side happens to be 100 in ten years and on the Minnesota side it is 300 by 2020.

Haugen reported that just as we are trying to identify the short-term, we are also working with both States in making sure we are consistent and are working cooperatively with them if they have mid-term targets, and then with what their ultimate long-term vision items are. He added that so far all indications from both States is that they aren't really going to identify anything to fill in these blank cells. He said that Minnesota has indicated that they are working towards some mid-term visions, but for fatalities it is zero.

Haugen commented that those are the five targets that the MPO must have in its plan, and we must adopt our five targets by February of next year; but there are some additional federally required targets in each State's Highway Safety Plan, and we are required to show that we are responsible in helping the State achieve these targets and these performance measures. He said that the short message is that we are focusing on these five, but we also have to recognize that there are these other targets that we need to somehow address in our planning document as well. He pointed out that a lot of them build on these five, but then get more specific. Grasser asked if the first set of goals are federal, and these are State goals. Haugen responded that these are federally required at the State Highway Safety Plan, which we are not required to have all eight of these, just as we are required to have these five, we are required to show how we are assisting the State in achieving these eight goals. Vein asked if we have to have valid information showing that we are doing that. Haugen responded that we do.

Haugen stated that we have the option of, we could identify these specifically to just our area, or, for these, it seems like we might just want to help the State with their targets and have individual statements or something along that line that shows how we are going to assist the State in achieving those things. He said, though, that his current thought process of not trying to identify

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

specific targets for each of these that we might be doing for each of these. Vein commented that he thinks that makes sense, that we would work with our States for that goal and stay focused on those other five.

Grasser referred to the example of performance based planning slide and pointed out that it says Goal 8 is Safety; and the first measure is number of unrestrained passenger vehicle occupant fatalities, and said that it is just a statement of reporting a number. Haugen responded that they haven't created this table. He said that they have that information to create this table to show you what, just as the number of traffic fatalities, we can show the number of unrestrained occupant fatalities. He added that each State has identified a number in their Highway Safety Plan, so we just haven't filled out this table for these eight items. He commented that these are annual targets, and the Highway Safety Plan is an annual document.

Haugen reported that the next slide shows what is specific to just our MPO area for those targets. He pointed out that the first one is fatalities, and explained that one of the things that we are running into is that there is a federal requirement that we have a five-year rolling average, but the State of Minnesota has had some issues with their data system so they cannot provide us with their 2016 data. He said that we would prefer to use 2016 data, but if that is not a possibility the Technical Advisory Committee agreed that if we can only get 2011 data, we will have to show that. He pointed out, though, that you can see that we have small numbers compared to what the States have. He added that if we were to identify, again if we can't identify one side of the river, at an MPO level we would identify one for the whole MPO and that would currently look like a target of 2, or, because of two things; one is the overall long-term vision is zero and two is pretty close to zero we could just identify zero in this case, and the other would be that for us there really isn't a penalty if we don't achieve that zero. He explained that our targets aren't impacting the penalty clause because those are only impacted at the State target level.

Mock stated, considering these are accidents she would think everyone would prefer to have that number always be zero, but how does it work if; say we put 2015 at zero, and we choose our goal of zero, what happens if we have a fatality, then that is almost a 100% increase, or 200% if there are two people in the car, would we be penalized for that; what if our goal is zero and we don't meet that because of an accident, then what happens. Haugen responded that there is no penalty under what the current federal law requires; if we aren't achieving that goal, or that target, that doesn't apply at the MPO level. He added that we do have, though, the public perception penalty, if you will.

Grasser commented that part of his concern is, if we create a number that we can't meet, are we annually, then, going to be penalized that we missed that goal, and what corrective actions are you now going to have to consider to apply to meet that goal; that is what worries him, who is going to sit in question or judgement of that. He added that there may not be a penalty from a federal standpoint, but if nothing else there would be the public perception. DeMers said that he doesn't know how many people track the variability and federal guidelines, not many people he knows would notice that we haven't met what we stated as our goal. He added that, this is primarily an oversight function imposed by the federal government on the State. He said that he doesn't understand because it would be different if we were applying for or receiving money directly

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

from the federal government, but we aren't involved in the overall allocation, so we are a part of a bigger thing that is trying to figure this out so why aren't we just using what the States tell us to do and go with that, because they are the ones that are making the decision on allocation, not us; I mean, yes we apply and we try to do those things, but it isn't like the feds come to us and say "here is your fifty million dollars, spend it wisely", "how did you spend it, did you get these goals"; no, we go to the State and ask for funding and they then determine what the best use of their monies would be. Haugen responded that, ultimately, that might be what we decide, but a good part of what this process is exposing at the State level is, how little, sometimes, the State looks at how many crashes, and what types of crashes occur in urban areas, and this will allow our urban areas to maybe receive a few more dollars to help address some of these crash conditions, high crash locations, or systemic locations. Presentation continued.

Haugen referred to the timeline, and pointed out that we have to make a decision in February. He stated that we are still working through the process, and, again, part of that is exposing some of these items that might ultimately lead to more dollars coming in.

Haugen stated that the next slide tries to show the federally required performance measures, and their timelines. He added that there are some acronyms that he will try to explain: PM1 – Performance Measures #1 are the safety measures; PM2 – Performance Measures #2 are the pavement condition and bridge condition measures; and PM3 – Performance Measures #3 gets into reliability, timing reliability, freight time reliability, and greenhouse gas.

Haugen commented that PM2 and PM3, the State targets are due next May, and then the MPO will have 180 days after that, which will be November 16, 2018. He added that our current schedule is to have our draft plan available by the end of October instead of November. He said that right now on the Minnesota side, next Monday they are having a meeting with the MPO Directors to go over what PM2 is, and what data they currently have for PM2. He stated that on the North Dakota side they provided us with some snapshot of the pavement. He added that North Dakota still has not released, or provided the bridge data, so there is a future bridge meeting; and on the Minnesota side they are handling this on November 20th; and on December 15th there will be a meeting on the reliability of the freight reliability. He commented that the October 1 date includes all of this on the North Dakota side.

Vein stated that there are various MPOs, here and in Fargo, will there be some consistency amongst those, or are the even going to be consistent statewide too. Haugen responded that the answer to that is no because each MPO has a different set of data conditions, so it is very unlikely that Fargo/Moorhead will have these type of numbers, so as far as consistency, no. Vein said, they will all be looking for reductions, but the numbers will be different. He added that when you said the MPO had to have this done by that date, does that have to go back to the City Councils. Haugen responded that that would be part of the overall plan adoption process.

Grasser asked, these PM training, is that where we will find out, from the State's perspective, how far down the chain of streets that we have to measure and comply with; for instance we certainly recognize that we need to meet those on the State Highways that go through town, but do we have to meet them on every cul-de-sac and every dead-end corner in the City, safety measures are applied that way, but are we thinking the others won't be. Haugen responded that they won't.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Haugen commented that the thing about North Dakota shared, when we talk about pavement, what they shared with us is that the federal definition of what a poor pavement is is such poor pavement that they are estimating that they will have zero percent of their pavement being in poor condition. He explained that they are kind of saying that the federal target sort of becomes meaningless because we, as the public riding those pavements would say “we aren’t going to tolerate our pavement to get to the point where it is poor”, so they will have a different acceptance level of what poor is at the State level.

Haugen stated that the challenge with the reliability end is that when congress established that requirement, they also contracted with a firm to create the data for that reliability, and that is a national contract, and within that contract they have a performance level themselves where they have to have an acceptability of around 80% reliability of the data, but they are focusing their data collection on the large urban areas, where rural States like North Dakota is getting less collection of that data so it is more sporadic and our traffic will change considerably between data collection dates.

Haugen said that this is just to give a sense of, as we go through these processes, partner with the States, and he apologizes if he hasn’t stated this before, but you heard him say that part of what he is trying to achieve isn’t just adopting a State Target or not, it is to go through the process to see if there are opportunities to improve the availability of some of the federal pots of money that come into our metro area by sitting down with the States and saying “okay, what does this mean for us if we set a target, how does your current programming process open the door for us to achieve our target setting”.

Bridge Discussion

Haugen stated that since your last meeting; working with the City Administrators, as well as holding two Technical Advisory Committee meetings, it was thought that a joint meeting, which you have all been invited to and which most of you have stated you would be participating in, should be held. He added that the meeting is scheduled for tomorrow evening at 5:30 p.m. at the Townhouse Inn.

Haugen commented that included in the packet was a preliminary draft of a presentation, however he has made some tweaks to it since then, but he will try to go through it briefly. He stated that he hopes everyone had a chance to go through it and have some questions, tweaks, or comments you would like to see happen on it. He added that one thing he was missing on it was an agenda of what we are trying to achieve, so he is trying to identify what the agenda should be.

Haugen said that he would suggest that we have the meeting and operate it as a regular MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, so have Peggy there taking minutes, have a roll call, but because there really is no formal, at least he doesn’t anticipate any formal motions being made as it is more of an informational meeting, but it gives the meeting itself some overall structure, and our Chairman would be running it and keeping it in order. Vein commented, though, that there will be a number of different entities there, so while he understands needing structure, everyone will be at the table will they not. Haugen responded that we will have the room set up in a “U”

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

shape like we have here so everyone, as much as we can have fit around the table, will be sitting like we do here. Vein said that this basically came at the request of the council presidents and mayors. DeMers commented that he thinks that if we are going to run this in any kind of organized fashion, we are basically the entity that called the meeting, we should run it, that way it isn't run by either City Council or county, or such, but bringing people in as they want. Vein agreed that it seems logical that it goes through the MPO, but initially it was going to be handled outside the MPO because they didn't want it to get bogged down, that is why he is asking who is really running this, but he has no problem doing it if that is the City Administrators concur with it. Haugen stated that they do, and that is why the meeting is being held in the evening instead of when we usually meet at noon. DeMers suggested that maybe one of the agenda item should be some kind of confirmation that this is the organization that is going to run the lead on this. He added that we can put it out there that we have the representation, the expertise, and it is already in our mission to do this.

Haugen reported that he handed out copies of two main slides he added to his presentation; the agenda and then at the end a "where do we go from here" type discussion. He said that part of the request, as he understands it was getting updated information so that we know what is going on and what the today's costs might be. He referred to the slide, and stated that as part of our 2045 update, in our current scope-of-work, we had identified 32nd and Merrifield so we would be updating that data through what our current 2045 analysis cost, travel impacts, etc. are; but if we are going to add to that list, and update information, these are the things we need to consider.

Haugen suggested that we use a basic bridge design for all estimates. He referred to an example of a bridge design and went over it briefly.

Haugen commented that the issue of a high and dry versus floodable bridge may need to be revisited because of what was actually constructed, and we also have the flood protection project in the Fargo/Moorhead area which may impact our flood events, so the floodable analysis may not be as acceptable as it was twenty years ago. Vein commented that he was at the Fargo/Moorhead's Technical Advisory Committee meeting yesterday, and they are planning by December 15th to have that information for us because he asked, specifically what the impact is going to be here. He added that there has to be some level of upstream/downstream impacts and there was no way he wanted to be part of a process to approve it until we know, and we then would know what the mitigation impacts could be, because if it does increase, and his personal feeling is that it might happen, but if we have to mitigate it so that we aren't hurt we need to know about it. Vetter commented that there is also the issue of Altru's announcement, and if they decide to build the new hospital further south than its current location, and we have a 32nd Avenue bridge then you would want that bridge to be high and dry. Vein agreed, adding that he has to think that whatever bridge we build is high and dry because the other two bridges we have we know aren't, and at least that gives us some connect between the two communities, so for him it is probably a given that we would be high and dry no matter where it is located.

Grasser commented that he agrees, and said that both the Sorlie and the Point bridges go under water somewhere around the twenty-five year event or so, and even the Kennedy is only dry to about a fifty-year event, so he would think that if we are going to go through the effort of building a bridge it would be one that is going to stay open. Vein stated that he asked that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Fargo/Moorhead address a 50, 100, and 500 year flood, what the impacts would be for us. Powers asked what the flood of 1997 was. Vein responded that it was a 212 year event. He said that the other thing he told them when they talked about retention, was that he hopes that basin-wide retention would only increase the capacity for us, not be such that it would enhance Fargo's flood project.

Haugen stated that we certainly can show the cost either way, the challenge of even coming up this type of revenue has proved unfruitful, so doubling the revenue needed would increase that challenge. Vein commented that the thought he had though is that very topic, affordability. He asked if it is even possible to get funding to do a bridge, because he doesn't want to plan for something that will never happen, because availability of federal funds is certainly getting to be less and less it appears, and local funding isn't very good, so is it realistic that we can get funding for a bridge. He said that he thinks this is a really basic question we have to answer before we decide we want to continue with this huge effort. He added that he was around when we went through this before, and it was highly controversial because we would be going through neighborhoods that people aren't going to want, and would again, so if we aren't really able to build a bridge we should determine that now and not waste our time and effort on something that can't be done.

Vetter responded that he thinks, though, that if we don't commit to it no one looks for the money. He said that if we commit to it and say that it is on our ten year horizon then we start looking for the money, and we continue to look for the money; if it is out on the forty-year horizon on one worries about it and no one goes after any of the money, so if we commit to it and say that we are going to build it, then we start looking for the money and push our legislators for the money. Vein commented that there are only three areas that you are going to get the funding from; local, state, and federal, and what is the availability of funding on any of those levels for this kind structure, so again, there is the issue of just plain affordability, is it something we can get. He added that he would like to hear from the feds, the State, and us locally as to what the probability is of getting funding.

Strandell commented that he heard or read somewhere that MnDOT didn't think we needed another bridge, they couldn't justify it based on the traffic; but that may have changed. Haugen stated that it has changed. He explained that one of the things that changed was; the feasibility study that we did on Merrifield, when we did the benefit/cost methodology it came out to 2.2, that is when it changed for them. He said that prior to that the thought was that the cost is high, and the benefit isn't really there, but when we went through their benefit/cost methodology and it came at the 2.2 it was an eye opener for them, there is a lot of benefit for this cost.

Haugen reported that he doesn't know if we will get any answers from our State or Federal partners if we ask them if there is funding available. He explained that when the Thompson Bridge replacement was being discussed, if you had asked them if there was money available for it, there wasn't until the feds came up with the ARRA funding, then Minnesota quickly assigned funding for it, and with that in hand Grand Forks County was able to get the State to come up with funding on the North Dakota side, but until that happened nobody would have said there was funding available for replacing the Thompson Bridge, so it is a challenge.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Haugen commented that he thinks we are able to show there is a great benefit, not just for the new structures; but of our existing bridges, two of them are State Highways, and one, the Sorlie Bridge, particularly North Dakota they can't build out DeMers Avenue to meet the traffic demand that will be there if we don't have another bridge, so that affects their facility. He added that, just as we were discussing, on the interstate, forecasts show that on 32nd Avenue eight lanes won't even accommodate the capacity, we need a new interchange; and we will be having this same discussion with North Dakota on DeMers Avenue and the need for another bridge.

Strandell stated that the Thompson Bridge only occurred because Rich Sanders had a lot of the bridge planning work in place in advance, which goes with what Mr. Vetter is saying; if there is some planning done, and things are ready to go, if funding is becomes available then it moves forward.

Vein said that, knowing what happened with location, it would be nice to have some criteria available for selecting a location. DeMers stated that he gets what Mr. Vein is saying, that if you are going to go through, and it shouldn't be factored in as much, but the political capital burnt through that in going to people and saying there is a potential for a road or bridge, and getting people all riled up; there is definitely a difference between this and Thompson, where there weren't many people impacted, so if you are going to go through it you better at least not have to come back in ten years and say, "we are going to do it again" and keep getting people riled up, but, it is going to be push and push, and we are never going to have a full commitment of funding and fully assembled before it. Vein responded that he sees that both sides have very good arguments for where it should be located. He added that in the past East Grand Forks didn't want it too far south as it wouldn't do them any good; but Grand Forks saw it going through existing neighborhoods, and that was a problem, so each one has legitimate concerns about how to locate a bridge, and that hasn't changed.

Powers stated that one thing he things should be addressed is the Environmental Impact Statement because that is something that is causing Fargo a lot of problems, and those types of things can be quite time consuming. Mock said that she thinks that is definitely something that should be considered because your effort and your cost can drastically change depending on where you cross the river, and environmental impasse, or what you might have to do with the location, especially if you are talking about the idea of floodable versus high and dry, that is going to impact all of your impasse stuff depending on how you construct the bridge, and that is where your environmental would really come into play, and depending on how much it increases the base cost, that again relates back to all of these other things. She stated that, depending on where we would go, you may have some social justice considerations if you have to go through an existing neighborhood, and those impacts on homeowners that are already established, and things like that, so they would be factors that you would want to consider. DeMers commented that social justice is usually more focused on access than it is on whether you have to take homes isn't it. Mock responded that it is the impact to those people and whether they are receiving the same amount of benefit, or if that impact is an undo-burden.

Haugen commented that if you would look at our recently completed U.S.#2/U.S.Bus.#2 Study, we were able to do that study under the planning environmental linkage umbrella, and we got into those social justice issues. He added that what he was trying to identify was that under our normal practice on each five year plan we do get into what is the travel demand impact; hours

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

saved or changed; trip miles; what the cost is; and we do get into homes purchased, what we think that might be; businesses purchased and we come up with a benefit/cost of that.

Haugen said that one thing we are asking the States and the feds is if Merrifield is the site that we want, can we redo the analysis using today's numbers. He added that the question is, we were able to do this back ten years ago, has federal law changed on the eligibility of what we can do with planning dollars to prohibit us from doing this type of study anymore. He said that they have not responded yet. He reported that if we get agreement, we would normally look at this type of level, we would do that for the 32nd Avenue Corridor and that is in our original scope-of-work, but if we are going to add locations to look at this is the type of criteria or information we would be looking at; where does it detract traffic, where does it increase traffic at the different crossings, etc. He added that we can't just look at the crossings, but we have these other key places of our street network that are congested, or have always been forecasted as congested, so we have to analyze how these crossings impact those areas as well, and if we don't have additional crossings we know that we will probably have to plan for increased interchange allocations.

Vein asked if one of the driving forces behind this, when we first started talking about an additional bridge location, was the increased traffic we are having over the Point Bridge and on Reeves and Belmont roads. He said that it was his understanding is that we are looking for a potential in-town bridge, not Merrifield. DeMers commented that they have different functions, one would be more of an out-of-town/freight bridge, and the other is a local bridge. He added that that is why, when you talked about what the typical section would be, he doesn't think it would necessarily be the same for an in-town bridge as it would be for a bridge at Merrifield.

Vetter stated that the discussion at the last group meeting with the two cities that the focus was going to be on a local bridge, that Merrifield was going to be a separate issue, that they recognize that we need a Merrifield Bridge, but we also need a local bridge as well. Vein said that that is what he is thinking as well. Vetter commented that, the meeting tomorrow night shouldn't discuss the Merrifield Bridge at all, it should focus on a new local bridge. Vein responded that he thinks that was their intent of not going to the MPO because they thought we would make it into maybe a larger than they wanted process, let's just keep it realistic to what the two communities want and see if we can do it. Vetter agreed.

Grasser said that that might be one of the early topics tomorrow night is identifying where that area of interest is. He added that we kind of had a little bit of this conversation at the Technical Advisory Committee as well; and are we serving local traffic, local vehicles versus truck traffic and that kind of thing, and at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting there were questions when we got any further south than 32nd Avenue, if you get to 47th or 62nd, and if they are even viable, are they work talking about, because as you push that south then you start taking on more truck traffic, so that gets it down to how many locations we should look at. DeMers commented that the problem with not addressing Merrifield, and he agrees that the focus of this should be 32nd Avenue, but the problem is that right now is the time to do Merrifield because there hasn't been a lot of development there, so the costs will be lower.

Discussion on the pros and cons of locating a bridge at 32nd Avenue South ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

Vein asked if the Thompson Bridge would stay high and dry during a flood event. Haugen responded that it is dry to a 100-year event. Powers stated that he just asked that same question because some of the criteria in here calls for a bridge at 845, which is getting right up there.

Vein stated that he thinks we are having a good discussion, which is going to be only expanded when we are all together, and for him it is about what are we trying to accomplish at this joint meeting, and making sure that we gear our discussion towards that. He said that some of the high and dry issues may even come later, but the technical part is almost always the easiest part, it is the political part of the decision that is the hardest and what level of discussion can we have to address that, because if we can't do it politically, then we have problems. DeMers commented that the issue is, then, what's the action item you are looking for. Vein agreed, adding that that is the question that we need to come out of here. Strandell said that as soon as you mention 32nd Avenue there is going to be a group opposed to it. Vein responded that he thinks that no matter what location we say there will be a group that will oppose it on the North Dakota side; so we need to determine what is the problem we are trying to address with a bridge. Haugen responded that from staff's point of view it is trying to address what additional information are we trying to get; we are already set up in our scope to do 32nd Avenue and Merrifield, to update that data, but is there another location or two that we want to go into depth on. Vein said, again, that is a solution to the problem, he wants to know what problem we are trying to solve; what is the basic problem we are solving by adding a bridge, and he thinks he is hearing that it is a local traffic issue, it is the impact to the neighborhoods adjacent to the Point Bridge.

Grasser commented that we need to be careful about trying to bite off too much at the meeting. He said that part of it will be us listening to the City Councils as to what do we add to the studies we are already doing; we've got 32nd in it already, and do we want it to be a local road, just give us some of that basic criteria. He added that from his standpoint, trying to decide if this should be a high and dry or not a high and dry bridge is probably more applicable to the next iteration, and he thinks we first need to start talking about where does it make sense, because along with a high and dry will be impacts to the flood plain and our FEMA certification, and such, and to him it feels like it might be a little much to grab, too much detail, so he feels we should just focus on the goals and objectives of what we are trying to accomplish.

Haugen stated that he will send out what he thinks the agenda will be by the end of the day and if anyone has any concerns or changes, please let him know before 5:00 p.m. tomorrow.

MATTER OF T.I.P. PROJECT SOLICITATION

a. Minnesota T.A.P. Letter Of Intent

Haugen commented that if we had received a Transportation Alternatives application on the Minnesota side we would have vetted it through, but there were none submitted.

b. North Dakota Urban Road Program

Haugen said that we are still waiting for a decision on the Urban Roads program, so we are still expecting December for our Transportation Alternatives Program on the North Dakota side and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, November 15th, 2017**

our Highway Safety on the North Dakota side, but because they haven't made a decision on the Main Street Initiative and how it that impacts the Urban Road Program we are still not soliciting formally for those projects.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

b. Bill Listing For 10/14/17 to 11/10/17 Period

Haugen reported that you asked for the MPO bill listings, this is a list of the bills we had during the October 14, 2017 to November 10, 2017 period.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 15TH,
2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:35 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
JOINT RIVER CROSSING MEETING
Thursday, November 16th, 2017 – 5:30 P.M.
Townhouse Inn, Grand Forks, North Dakota**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the November 16th, 2017, Special Joint River Crossing Meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Others present: See Sign-In Sheets

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Vein, asked that everyone please state their name and the entity(s) they are representing for the record.

Vein thanked everyone for coming to tonight's meeting. He commented that, obviously, during one of the joint meetings between the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks this item came up for discussion, and there is a desire to have a little bit more conversation and learn a little bit more as we go forward, so he will turn this over to Mr. Haugen for a brief overview on the issue of potential future bridge locations, adding that he hopes we will have a conversation and talk about the merits of a bridge, the first of potentially many meetings going forward.

MATTER OF MPO CURRENT SCOPE OF WORK SPECIFIC TO FUTURE LOCAL TRAFFIC BRIDGE

Haugen said that he hopes everyone took a copy of the presentation he will be giving this evening, if not they are located at the back table. He reported that there shouldn't be much

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

deviation from the presentation, and you might notice that with this projector and this room some things might wash out, but hopefully the printed copy will help give you the balance you need to follow along.

Haugen commented that, as Chairman Vein mentioned, and hopefully most of you are aware the MPO is currently updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan. He said that there are websites available, and we try to engage the public through public meetings, wiki-mapping, and other tools.

Haugen stated that in relationship to future river crossings, as part of our every five year update of the transportation plan, we look at the potential impacts that future river crossings might have to the street network. He pointed out that some of the things we automatically look at with each of these updates are specific to the last two updates, and the one that we currently scoped for this update because the previous two plans had carried forward the locations of 32nd Avenue for a local bridge, and Merrifield for a truck reliever route. He said that the scope of this contract we have with a consultant, and for the update of this plan, was, again just to update information on those two bridge locations.

Haugen reported that we put out this wiki-map tool to have people go on-line and enter comments and identify what “hot spots” they feel are out there concerning traffic issues in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Haugen said that just to give you an idea of why we do this is because we historically have traffic issues occurring at the locations shown with stars on the map, that are relative for the needs that an additional river crossing would provide. He stated that currently we have the three crossings that are located on the northerly end of both communities, and a lot of growth has occurred to the south, and as we continue to grow we see increasing traffic problems on the major arterials that lead to and from them.

Haugen reported that because of the way the three river crossings are spaced together so closely, there is a lot of demand on the Sorlie Bridge. He stated that there is a project currently being scoped for 2019, and the future forecasts on the Sorlie would identify that a two lane DeMers Avenue will not be able to satisfy the capacity that will be available, and the NDDOT is recognizing that and they are not trying to scope out a project on DeMers to satisfy that capacity.

Haugen said that we have also identified in the future that Bygland Road, which has traffic issues today, as the community grows will continue to have those issues. He stated that there are some short-term/mid-term solutions that have been identified, but it would benefit from another river crossing.

Haugen stated that the major intersection of DeMers and Washington Street has issues today, and, again, as both communities grow, this intersection carries traffic from two river crossings, and those issues will increase.

Haugen reported that we are just starting to wrap up a study for Grand Forks of their Near Southside Neighborhood. He explained that it was generated by concerns by the neighborhood of through traffic cutting through their neighborhood that isn't really destined to their

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

neighborhood, and in addition to that the through traffic is felt to also generate speed issues along that corridor.

Haugen said that since 2010, when the NDDOT had its last annual traffic counts for the three river crossings; the Kennedy and the Sorlie are fairly flat with their growth, however the Point Bridge has gone from roughly 5,000 cars a day to 7,500 cars a day, so almost a 50% increase in traffic and he would venture to guess that is why the neighborhood is starting to notice more change in traffic.

Haugen commented that, to give you a sense of perceived directional flow of the traffic on the Point, he thinks there is a myth that the traffic flow in the morning is all East Grand Forks people coming across, particularly the Point Bridge, into Grand Forks. He said that the actual traffic counts that we have for the spring of this year is a flow of 60%/40%; 60% flowing westward and 40% flowing eastward. He added that that has changed somewhat, ten years ago that flow was 55% /45%.

Haugen stated that when we look at Reeves Drive in particular, we actually have more traffic heading northbound on Reeves turning right to go east in the morning and the reverse in the evening. He said that this suggest that there is quite a bit of Grand Forks traffic using this route as well.

Haugen reported that every five years we not only look at the transportation system, but we also go through each Cities' land use and update the Land Use Plan. He stated that the next two slides give us a sense of how the Cities are forecasting their growth is different than it was five years ago; and again we are looking out to the year 2045.

Haugen referred to the 2040 vs 2045 Household changes slide and pointed out that the negative numbers indicate that we are moving or shifting, in this case, housing out of an area and the green numbers are placing them in the green areas. He said that they only identified those that saw a major shift of the housing number. He added that they are moving away from the southwesterly part of the city and into the existing built-up area of the community using the existing infrastructure for Grand Forks. He commented that for East Grand Forks the land use plan was not that significantly different than the 2040 plan was, when it comes to households.

Brett Weber, Grand Forks City Council, said, then, that this is a shift from what projects were to what the new projects are; we had previously been projecting a lot of growth out to that 40th Street S.W., and now because of the shifts, we are seeing less growth. Haugen responded that that is correct, that it is what the plan is calling for.

Haugen referred to the 2040 vs 2045 Employment changes slide and, again you see the shifts away from some areas to the existing areas, and also the City of Grand Forks has what they call strategic growth areas, and you will see some of the employment shift up to those strategic growth areas. He commented that from East Grand Forks it moves some from the American Crystal area and spreading it to a couple other areas.

Haugen referred to the employment slide and pointed out that where the existing Altru campus is located. He explained that Altru recently made an announcement that they are going to be

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

constructing a new hospital in a few years, so for now we are holding this steady with 2015 conditions as we aren't sure if there will be growth there or at a different location.

Haugen commented that the next couple of slides will show you what our 2040 traffic projections are. He explained that because of the changes taking place in the land use, the numbers you see here most likely will not hold true when we show them in our 2045 document.

Haugen reported that because this has been a potentially major swing thing to traffic conditions in the two communities, when we do our major studies we are always asked to look at what happens if we have a river crossing at 32nd or Merrifield, how does it change the corridor we are studying, so the graphic showing is from our I-29 Study that we just completed, and one of the concerns was if we had river crossings at any of these locations how would that change traffic. He said that this graphic shows you what the 2040 traffic volume change would be, and he highlighted the one spot, on the Grand Forks side, for the 32nd Avenue location.

Haugen commented that with the color bands on the graphic, you can see where traffic is being taken away from and where it is building to across the 32nd. He said that because this meeting was intended to focus just on the local traffic, he isn't including anything on the Merrifield site, not meaning that that is a foregone conclusion that it will be built.

Vein stated, so, again, the 2040 plan has a bridge at 32nd and one at Merrifield. Haugen responded that they are identified as a location, but because of fiscal constraint they aren't identified as being in place by 2040, and that has been the case in the 2035 and 2030 plans as well. He added that you can see that the 32nd site does provide relief to the Point Bridge, but, and this is an important thing to know, is that it takes traffic off the DeMers Avenue area as well.

Haugen reported that as part of our normal update of the transportation plan this would be the type of information that we would be generating with our current scope of work. He added that what he has identified is that we will do a cost estimate to reflect 2016 dollars, and we will do a benefit/cost analysis, which will be done on both sites, but we are just focusing on the local City bridge site.

Haugen commented that because of our I-29 experience; where our travel demand model forecast was telling us that 32nd Avenue's travel demand could be satisfied by adding just two additional through lanes between Columbia Road and I-29, and that is what the plan reflects; but when they did a more aggressive micro-analysis of the traffic conditions in that area they found that that traffic demand couldn't even be satisfied by eight lanes on 32nd Avenue. He said, than that one the new things we want to make sure is done in this plan is to take it to that next level, which we wouldn't normally do in a planning effort, but because the I-29 study showed that there could be this great of a difference we are going to do that with this new plan that is already under scope. He added that for the local city traffic bridge volumes, we never really forecasted them in all the years he has been here, something that would have over 10,000 vehicles a day on it, whereas on 32nd Avenue we were in the 40,000, so that sensitivity was there at 32nd, it may or may not be there at the river sites, however, just to have peace of mind, and since it doesn't cost that much more, that will include it in the 2045 update.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

Haugen stated that, again, the intent is that if we decide to go down the road, and we are going to aggressively try to build it, and then we find out that we erred and we need a lot more capacity at that site than we thought, to try to avoid the error.

Haugen said that the other thing we did with the I-29 study was going from a straight benefit cost analysis to a cost effective analysis. He explained that what this was trying to tell us is that, yes it might have a benefit cost greater than one but this analysis is telling us whether we should actually build the structure within the lifetime of that transportation plan, twenty-five years. He added that in the past, in the 2040 plan, we just had the benefit cost that tells us that it is a great benefit cost but it really doesn't tell us how critical the need is compared to other projects in the next twenty-five years.

Haugen reported that when the joint meeting was held it was discussed as to who should look into this further; and at the next MPO Board meeting Clarence Vetter, East Grand Forks City Council/GF-EGF MPO Policy Board, raised the question that the cities would like to look at updating some of the information, and we were already under scope to do that for the locations that are in previous plans, so the Board asked staff to take a look at what it would be to have additional locations studied in the 2045 plan update.

Haugen said that the Technical Advisory Committee met several times on this, and as technicians tend to do we got into rather detailed information, and when we presented it to the board they asked that it be scaled back and simplified, so that is what we have before us today. He added that we do have several Technical Advisory Committee members here, so, currently under scope, just for 32nd Avenue, we will be doing this analysis. He said that we do have funds available, and the opportunity to look at other sites if that is the desire.

MATTER OF OTHER LOCATIONS MPO CAN PROVIDE SIMILAR INFORMATION

Haugen commented that the next few items are just raising the question; are there other locations for a local bridge that services the traffic primarily between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He stated that generally it has always been considered, for the forty-plus years of a Metropolitan Transportation Plan, to be somewhere south of the current three river crossings. He referred to an aerial photo and explained that is a fairly current photo of the southern part of the two communities and possible locations at four sites that can be looked at in a little more conversational manner. He added that when the decision was made in the 2030 plan, it was right when the flood protection project was being built and designed, and now we have what is in place on the ground to consider at these different locations that may or may not make some of the locations more challenging today.

Discussion

Duane Rene, Grand Forks Resident, asked if Mr. Haugen had information available on the 2030 plan that we can compare with this. Haugen responded that he has his laptop, but explained that it really isn't a fair apple to apple comparison because the land use plans, every five years, aren't similar enough to give us a sense of how they would compare with each other. Rene stated that the trouble is we put it off for so many years, and extended it further and further south of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks for bridges, and we are looking for 2045; what's happening between

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

now and 2045 on these bridges. Haugen responded that that is part of the reason for tonight's meeting, to help answer that question. He added that in the past the issue has been controversy and lack of revenue; spending funds on needs elsewhere, but the one thing he can compare the 2030 to the 2040, and likely the 2045 plan is that the communities are predominantly growing southward, so that puts pressure on the three existing bridges, and mostly on the most southern one, and the corridors that lead to and from the Point Bridge, that is a fairly consistent thing.

Mark Olstad, East Grand Forks City Council, asked if there has been any discussion on any of the locations of them not being feasible at any cost, it isn't going to happen so that it can be removed from the list. Haugen responded that there has. He explained that we looked at relocating the Point Bridge because ten years ago there was a project to repaint and do some maintenance type work on the Point Bridge and discussion was held on the possibility of just letting it go and locate a new one somewhere else so we looked at that issue, we looked at 8th Avenue South, and these are all Grand Forks street references, we looked at 13th Avenue South, 17th Avenue South, Elks Drive, 24th Avenue South, 25th Avenue South, 32nd Avenue South, and 47th Avenue South for the local traffic. He stated that, obviously the Point Bridge was repainted and maintenance done so the decision was to live with what we have there. He added that 8th Avenue South and 13th Avenue South, you kind of see that the Lincoln Golf Course, Club House, etc., and how the street network leads into it, were determined not to be locations that we wanted to put a vehicle bridge across; so that is where 17th Avenue South, Elks Drive, and 32nd Avenue South were actually placed in the Greenway Plan as potential future corridors, the other sites were more or less released from consideration at the time.

Haugen reported that at one time the MPO did go through a mediation process, and the outcome was a unanimous decision to try to locate a bridge at Elks Drive. He said, though, that when it was submitted to the individual City Councils approval processes, it was not favored and so we were back at the drawing board. He stated that the end result was where we currently have 32nd Avenue for the local bridge site.

Brett Weber, Grand Forks City Council, stated that, you mentioned sprawl, and the governor's hope is that we would stay away from expensive sprawl things; and one of the things we need to consider the further south we go with a bridge, the more encouraging we would be with additional sprawl. He added, though, that on the other hand, whoever thought that it was a good idea to put the Point Bridge where it is at because just putting another bridge a block south isn't really solving anything; how did we come up with that decision and how do we avoid that mistake because too far south you've got sprawl and too far North and we are just concentrating on traffic, how did that happen. Haugen responded that we can only speculate that that is where the point of East Grand Forks meets, and that is where the demand was to have a method to and from East Grand Forks to Grand Forks on the southern side. Powers added that that is where the city began. Weber asked if that was a new bridge, there wasn't a bridge at the Point before. Powers responded that there was a bridge there before the existing bridge was constructed as a replacement.

Sandi Marshall, Grand Forks City Council, asked if the 47th Avenue potential site still in the running or has it been ruled out. Haugen responded that the last three plans did not include it as a site, but this time doesn't mean we can't open it up again if that is the desire, but he thinks that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

with the scope-of-work we already have we aren't looking at 47th Avenue but we can certainly add it to the mix.

Rene asked if it wouldn't be better to look at 47th Avenue since they want an interchange on I-29 at the same time in order to have a straight shot to the east side. Haugen responded that what we found out with the actual interstate study we did was that the river crossings really don't have a lot of relationship to the interstate traffic, particularly when we get south of Gateway Drive.

Vein said that, again the current plan shows 32nd Avenue as the preferred location, and that will be in the 2045 plan unless we recommend something different. Haugen responded that that is correct, that that will be the default we would move forward. Vein said, then, that the question is whether we want to analyze additional crossings beside 32nd Avenue, and if we do to get some feedback as to what that might look like. He said that there were originally two things that he was looking at; the need for the bridge and the ability to actually build it, we have to be able to fund it. He added that the MPO Board members talked about it, and whether or not it should be above the 100-year flood plain for the local level, and what the size would be, and he thinks those details are yet to be decided, but the question before us is shouldn't we be investigating other locations, because that opens up a can of works for us, and is it going to be affordable because there is no use planning for something that we can't afford. He commented that we know we will need federal participation of some sort to make it affordable, so we would need to get into some of that detail too, so part of this is to look at what that location might be that is affordable, because if it is a location that doesn't work from the federal side, then we need to be aware of that because that will require a whole different funding formula.

Nick West, Grand Forks County Engineer, asked if Merrifield/County Road 6 still part of this. Haugen responded that, again, this whole update process would determine whether it stays in or is taken out; it is currently in the plan as a future bridge location, just not a funded one that would be constructed by 2040. Vein added that 32nd Avenue isn't funded in 2040 either, it is just shown as a future location. Haugen commented that another term you have probably heard, the word "illustrative projects", those would be examples of illustrative projects in our plan; the 42nd Street Grade

Separation project is another unfunded project in our plan.

Dana Sande, Grand Forks City Council, asked, with the flood protection that both cities have, and if we want to build a bridge that is above the 100-year flood plain, we are going to end up building a half-mile long bridge, or is there an area that you can think of off the top of your head where the flood protection is close enough that we aren't looking at a \$250 million dollar bridge. Haugen referred to a map of the area, and pointed out that you can see that you are getting down, between 24th Avenue and 32nd Avenue, where it is the closest. He explained that the reason the Elks Drive option was considered was because it had an existing opening in the dike system so at that time the decision was that we would be acceptable to have a floodable bridge for a few days a year some years, and the distance was shorter, by half, than the other locations. Sande asked if it was the Grand Forks City Council that took up the discussion, and there was public feedback, or were both Cities unable to come to the conclusion that that was good spot for a future bridge. Haugen responded that it was an eight to six vote at Grand Forks Council, with fourteen members at the time, against Elks Drive.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

Vein asked if there were cost potential at the time, and what were they. He said that, obviously we know that it takes a lot more detail to come up with the actual cost, but there must be some ballpark range. Haugen responded that, again, the 32nd Avenue bridge, when we looked at it in our 2040 plan, is identified to cost around \$25 million dollars; the 17th Avenue Bridge is estimated at a similar cost; the Elks Drive Bridge was not identified in the 2040 plan, but was estimated to cost about half what the other two cost. He added that the assumption was that these costs are for bridges that aren't high and dry during a flood event, similar to the Point Bridge function as a bridge for local traffic, that isn't necessarily meant to remain open during our major flooding events.

Sande asked, if we as a growing community decided that it made sense to have a bridge that would function if we had a 100-plus year flood event; do you have any kind of concept, if, let's say that everyone is happy with putting a bridge at 32nd Avenue tomorrow, but we want a tall bridge, what kind of dollars are we talking about. Haugen responded that it would be double the cost. Vein commented that he thinks that is actually on the light side, but it is just a guess, and no matter what you are talking about a lot of money.

Vein commented that the existing bridges; the Point and the Sorlie are about 25-year level bridges, and the Kennedy is about a 50-year level bridge, so we know that with a major flood event we will be separated unless we were to build a bridge that meets the high/dry level, but at what cost.

Les Noehre, NDDOT-Grand Forks District, stated that he has to leave for another meeting so he would like to address the issue of federal aid on the North Dakota side. He said that the City of Grand Forks already receives federal aid through the Urban Roads Program and a bridge would be eligible for those funds. He said that the City would be able to use its federal aid, but as far as the Regional Federal Aid program, these locations are not on a State Highway, so they would not be eligible for Regional Federal Aid, nor for Rural Federal Aid; so, again, the federal aid that would be available to the City would be the Federal Aid it already receives through the Urban Federal Aid Program. He added that, currently how State Law reads, could we spend State dollars on it either since it isn't on a State Highway. J.T. Anderson, MnDOT-Crookston, stated that Minnesota's dollars work pretty much identically to North Dakota's.

Noehre asked if anyone had any other questions concerning federal aid. Vein said that was what he wanted to make sure we were aware of, what that opportunity would be. West asked, though, if a special bill could be put through legislation to get funding. Noehre responded that the State Legislature could fund and authorize special State funds for it, absolutely. West asked what it would take to do this. Noehre responded that, just some quick numbers for you; North Dakota receives between \$240 and \$250 million dollars in federal aid every year, \$32 million comes out of that right off the top for urban programs, for the fourteen cities above 5,000 in population, they pay consultants and a bunch of other fees, and there are other bills that have to be paid, so it ends up around \$90 to \$100 million dollars to cover 8,000 miles of rural roads, that isn't a lot.

Mock asked if we are still considering 24th Avenue South as a possible location, or has it been eliminated. Vein responded that the discussion was that we could use 24th Avenue South or 17th Avenue South as potential locations, but it is all locally funded. Mock said, though, that that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

the same with 32nd. Vein asked if 32nd Avenue South on any of the state systems. He said that he knows that 32nd Avenue South west of Washington Street is, but he isn't sure if the rest of it is. Noehre responded that it is U.S. Business 81 from Washington to the Interstate, but east of Washington is not. Vein asked if we could change that designation. Vein responded that adding miles to the State system, could it, sure, any roadway could be added to the State system. He explained that there is legislative restrictions on the number miles that we can add as well, but where we are at with that restriction he isn't sure.

Haugen commented that you talked about a 100-year flood event, and trying to have passible bridge traffic, is that 32nd Avenue is where the East Grand Forks flood protection ends at the river and heads east, so anything south of the East Grand Forks flood protection system has the additional challenge that it isn't in an area meant to be protected by the flood protection. He said that the only other interesting thing that happens once you get outside of the East Grand Forks flood protection system is you are likely not talking about working with East Grand Forks on partnering with a bridge, you would be working with Polk County instead.

Malm asked how the Fargo/Moorhead Diversion project will impact everything. Vein responded that he thinks that is in the process of being determined right now, but obviously he is going to be well aware of any impacts that it may have on our community at all, and how it can be mitigated, it needs to be mitigated.

Olstad asked if, hypothetically, you added two sites to the study, what would that increase the cost to to do that. Haugen responded that he would think that if it is just 2 sites, and it is replicating the work that we are doing, probably in the \$50,000 to \$60,000 cost frame. Haugen reported that this would be additional work for the MPO, and we do have the funds to do it, however we would need local match, and that would be essentially .10 on every \$1.00 of the cost.

Grasser stated that he thinks that part of the process of determining elevations is going to be hydraulic analysis, and he is assuming that will be part of the study for whatever locations we look at. He added that from what he remembers, way back in the beginning when we were developing the flood projects, there were some discussions with the pedestrian bridges, and his general recollection is there are certain elevations that we have to avoid to keep from impacting our profile during the 100 year or higher flood events, and in simplistic terms; they either have to be really low or really high, but he thinks the decision of elevation isn't just going to be arbitrary. Haugen commented that the cost estimate he provided included hydrological analysis, but that gets pretty pricey pretty fast, and with the Fargo/Moorhead protection project still kind of up in the air we aren't sure what will be hydraulically modeled.

West asked if there was any consideration for truck traffic movement in the model, and how will that impact the area because we are having a hard time getting a new bridge built, much less talking about two bridges, but freight has to be considered in this whether or not eliminate the Point Bridge, or allow for freight movement. He stated that one thing he thinks about is what do we want the bridge to do, what is the function of it; is it just to move people around in town or is it going to include agricultural traffic, so he would encourage a location that could do both of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

those things. Haugen responded that, again, it is scoped to look at a local traffic bridge similar to the Point Bridge, so it can be added to the study, the current scope of work would not consider it to be also used for freight movement. Sande asked who made the decision not to scope it for freight, and for the flood plain; what it a previous board. Haugen responded that it was the basic continuation of just updating the current plan, these were agreeable for the last fifteen years as the parameter of these things.

Sande commented that he thinks that at some point we need to have an honest discussion about what we actually want; if we are going to move forward with a bridge, what purpose is it going to serve, are we going to try to move freight, are we going to try to get out of the flood plain, and where are we going to put it. He said that he think we should have this discussion; personally we either need to make the decision and try to move forward or quit talking about it.

Powers asked about the 32nd Avenue configuration; what happens when you get over to the Minnesota side, does it go straight over to 40th. Haugen responded that East Grand Forks would actually build out a road straight over to Bygland Road or County 72.

Discussion on high and dry bridges in the area ensued – One at Drayton and Thompson.

Sando commented that, and this is his opinion, but if we are going to build a bridge, he can't imagine that we would put in the money and not build above the 100 year flood plain, he just can't imagine that we would build another bridge that is going to go underwater; if we are going to put money in, he thinks we should spend a little bit more to get it above the flood plain. He added that he doesn't particularly care if we allow truck traffic on it, and he agrees that there would potentially be some farm equipment or farmers that would want to cross, but he doesn't know if that is as important to him, personally, as getting it high enough so that if we have a major event our communities are still connected.

Vein reported that the MPO Executive Policy Board met yesterday and talked about getting good information. He added that we know this isn't going to happen overnight, so we need to start planning now, and start doing such things as trying to get that on the State Highway System, along with a lot of other things that will need to fall into place, before we will be able to build a bridge; including the funding and all of this that comes together, so the idea was that we have to start sometime, someplace, so should we start looking at that now and making sure that everything is in place because if you want to build it as high as you are talking about it is \$50 to \$75 million dollars, and if it is only going to be local money, it probably isn't going to happen, so the only way we are going to be able to have one at that elevation is to have federal monies available for it and that is going to take a process to get now.

Weber asked Kurt Kruen, North Dakota Senator, if he had a sense of the challenge of getting 32nd Avenue added as a State road, because we are talking about a mile of roadway aren't we. Kruen responded that nothing is impossible, but if you take a look at the funding, we have been getting less funding, and in fact they have been trying to sell fix up DeMers Avenue and sell it to us so we will be responsible for it in the future, and they have been doing that throughout the State, so they have been trying to get rid of property rather than take on more, so it would be an uphill battle to add 32nd Avenue to the State system. Vein agreed, adding that it isn't just about getting on the system, it the dollar cost that will be associated with it because then you are going

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

to have a mile of roadway to get there, then build a bridge on our side and still have to do the connection on the east side, so it will be tougher yet.

DeMers stated that he thinks we need to bring ourselves back and ask the right question; “what do we want”. He said that we can get into the minutia of how we are going to pay for it, do we want it above or below the flood plain, etc., but before we decide what we want we are going to be talking about that at six different spots, and just the math, and a bridge doesn’t work that way, we aren’t going to be able to focus on something; so, from his perspective, and a little bit of what the MPO Board was looking at is can we decide on what we want and from East Grand Forks’ perspective, their Mayor has said that we do have to set the priority and mentioned that, yes we do look at Merrifield Road as a benefit to the region, but we also want a local road and the constituents he represents, our desire, our wish is for a local access road. He stated that they don’t have any near-term desire to push for Merrifield Road at this time, they think it should be part of the planning phase so that when it comes it comes, but what people in East Grand Forks want is a local access road, so in their opinion 32nd Avenue, 24th Avenue, possibly 47th Avenue, would be where they would like the focus to be. He added that if we can decide that we want to start targeting a local access road, once we decide what we want then we can put numbers to it; it is this much for a high bridge, this much for a floodable bridge, how are we going to pay for it, is it federal or state, etc. He commented that, if we stopped looking at projects because they aren’t funded we would never do anything because most of the stuff, especially the big stuff, people at that level don’t have it in their program, and that is what everything is now, it is all programmed; so we need to think what do we want and then go after it, because, we have talked even at the MPO, but we can do PDP, you can do all these other things, we can get creative and figure it out and come to a consensus of what we want; and that is why he wanted to kind of bring us back and say “is that what we want”, do we want a local access road, a local access bridge, and if that is what we want then let’s go after it.

Malm commented that we really have to look far into the future, most of us won’t be here when this bridge is built, and he truly believes that, by the time you do all of the things you have to do. He said that they built the Thompson bridge because they suddenly got a huge sum of money, called “surge” money on both sides of the river, and they went in and fought with the State Legislature and they gave us the money to build it. He stated that his point is is that we always short-term plan in this part of the country, we don’t look way into the future, and he thinks we need to start looking way out there because he thinks the Merrifield bridge we had some things done years ago but they got away from us because we started arguing all the time, and there is a political thing that something’s got to be done, so make up your mind where you think it should go and then you better go out and sell it in your community because he doesn’t hear a lot of people, and he knows what Mr. DeMers said because he listened to all those arguments when they tried to go down 24th Avenue and a resident stood up and said her children will never cross the street, but all of this stuff gets wrapped in it so you’ve got to just bite the bullet and if they say no...when Mr. Weber asked why they built the Point Bridge there...cause that is where they wanted it, they never worried about anything else, so we just have to decide where want to go, somebody has to take it and say “now we worked on a long term project”.

Haugen referred to a graphic and stated that one of the answers we can probably get cheaply and easily is, just something that tells us like this graphic tells us, if we place it here how does it

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

impact the traffic volumes to the network; and we can look at two more sites to just that level of detail and that might eliminate one or both, or it might show that they are all good, and then we can go into the next level of detail at those sites. He said that this might be a way to give some other sites just that one level of review, and it is the traffic point of view that will tell us, if you put it here, what traffic does it take away from the existing network and how does it overload the local system where it is at.

Vein reiterated that 32nd Avenue is in the plan right now so we don't have to do anything with that; so the question maybe before us is do we want to look at any others beyond 32nd Avenue and what is the timing of us having to make that decision. Haugen responded that preferably it would be before, we would be authorized to execute the amended scope of work so that by the end of February we have done this first part, so we would like to have it in January. Vein said, then, that our December MPO Executive Policy Board meeting would be the logical time to have the decision made of, if additional locations are going to be studied, which locations would they be. Haugen responded that that is correct. Vein added that the estimated cost for adding two more locations would around \$50,000.00 to \$60,000.00. Haugen responded that that would be if we looked at them at the same level we scoped for 32nd Avenue, but he is suggesting for maybe our first glance would be to just do something with the traffic volumes, and not do the cost benefit and cost effectiveness at this time, just to give us some sense of whether it provides us the relief to the areas we need relief. He added that, generally in the past, as we go further south the less it gives us benefit to the existing bridges, and we can do that fairly easily and it won't come close to \$60,000.00, more like a third of the cost.

Grasser commented that, just on those thoughts, Elks Drive and 24th Avenue South are so close together here you could almost pick one of those to do your traffic analysis, they are almost going to be the same; so you could do 17th Avenue South, 24th Avenue South, 32nd Avenue South, and you could add 47th Avenue South if you wanted to as well.

Vetter asked if 17th Avenue South is even feasible since the walking bridge, and new housing, etc., have gone in there. Brad Bail, East Grand Forks City Engineer, responded that he thinks you could make it work, it would be a matter of where you lay out the bridge.

Grasser stated that he thinks just getting the traffic analysis as the data point there, he can see a number of reasons why it might drop off, but if you are doing all the traffic analysis in the modeling anyway, it wouldn't take much to do those two additional locations at the same time.

Haugen reported that for the modeling effort at 17th Avenue we would simply take a road and then go straight over to Rhinehart Drive, and model the results. He stated that for 24th Avenue, it would be similar; and for 32nd Avenue it too would be the same, and those models would give us what impact they have, traffic wise, and we could display that information to this group, and to the public, and get feedback on which, if any of the locations we should focus on.

Malm commented that he personally thinks that is a waste of time if we put it on 24th Avenue South; look what is on 24th Avenue South on the Grand Forks side, you've got two schools, you have all of the natural things that get people upset, they don't worry about the money. Sande

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

stated that they also have two school on 32nd Avenue as well. Malm agreed, saying that that is right, you've got to stay away from that, that is what he is trying to say. Sande asked where he would like to go then. Malm responded that he would go to Merrifield.

Sande asked if there was any signage along the Merrifield corridor stating that it is a proposed future bridge location, so that people that buy property around there, and put up their houses know that a bridge is going to come in. Larry Young, Grand Forks, responded that there is; and he would appreciate it if those signs don't come down because all the work that has been done, and they appreciate the work in keeping that on the map as a possible bridge location, it would be a shame to have those signs come down because that is always a problem; people start building in an area and then when we want to come in and do something like a bridge they say "hey, not in my backyard", so those signs are still there, thank you.

Vein stated that, again, the plan right now does call for one at Merrifield and one at 32nd Avenue, so the question, in part, is that we want it at 32nd for a different location, so your Merrifield idea is there, the question is should the study look at another location other than or in addition to 32nd Avenue. Sande commented that, yes, he thinks we should look at one at 17th Avenue South.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO AMEND THE SCOPE-OF-WORK TO INCLUDE, IN ADDITION TO 32ND AVENUE SOUTH AND MERRIFIELD, A TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AT 17TH AVENUE SOUTH AND 24TH AVENUE SOUTH.

Vein stated that, while everyone can certainly have input into this item, the vote will be done by the MPO Executive Policy Board. Vetter added, though, that if approved we will have to take this back to our respective City Council to get approval to spend the extra local match monies. Vein agreed, and asked, approximately how much local match would be needed. Haugen responded that each community pays 10% of the cost of the study, it's 80% MPO and 20% local split between the two cities.

Sande asked if we could add 47th Avenue just to get the data for it. He added that he recognize that it is too far south for East Grand Forks, but wouldn't it be nice just to see how it would affect the traffic.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE DOING A TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AT 47TH AVENUE SOUTH AS WELL.

Haugen stated that what he is going to ask is clarity and for confirmation of how he would approach this is, we would do a combination of Merrifield with another bridge location unless and until we locate another bridge location; in other words we don't want to pair up all these three additional sites with the pair that are in the current plan, and we would hold off on pairing the travel model results.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO AMEND THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT STUDY TO INCLUDE, IN ADDITION TO 32ND AVENUE SOUTH AND MERRIFIELD, A TRAFFIC ANALYSIS AT 17TH AVENUE SOUTH, 24TH AVENUE SOUTH, AND 47TH AVENUE SOUTH.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, November 16th, 2017**

Strandell asked, if the local share portion of the studies, outside of the Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, would that revert to the counties, and if so... Haugen responded that it has not in the past. Strandell asked who would pay it then. Haugen responded that the two cities would be paying the local match. Strandell said, though, that the bridges are not in the City limits. DeMers responded that this is still part of the study. Strandell stated that he just wanted clarification on this.

Mock asked if when we get those results back can we see how that alleviates pressure on the Point Bridge, will we have that data. Haugen responded that we will have similar data as what you saw on the I-29 Study.

Weber asked for clarification on the estimated dollar amount for this. Haugen responded that he would estimate the cost at around \$20,000.

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

Voting Nay: Malm and Strandell.

Absent: None.

Abstaining: None.

Vein commented that once we know the actual cost, if the local match amount is small enough it may not be necessary to get approval from the respective City Councils. David Murphy, East Grand Forks City Administrator, responded that staff can approve up to \$10,000 without Council approval, however they will certainly be notified of the additional cost.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 16TH,
2017, JOINT RIVER CROSSING MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
AT 6:48 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 20th, 2017 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the December 20th, 2017, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent were: Jeannie Mock and Al Grasser.

Guest(s): David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

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 Office Manager.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 15TH AND NOVEMBER 16TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 15TH AND NOVEMBER 16TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2017 HOLIDAY HOURS

Haugen reported that, as you know, the MPO mirrors the City of Grand Forks' personnel policies; and, just as they have historically done in the past, they have granted their employees four hours of what is now termed "Holiday Bonus Hours". He stated that the MPO has done this in the past so staff is seeking approval to offer this to our employees as well. Vein agreed, adding that the Grand Forks City Council did approve this for its employees at their last City Council meeting.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE A FOUR HOUR
2017 HOLIDAY BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2018 MNDOT STATE PLANNING CONTRACTS

Haugen reported that this is an annual agreement that we enter into with the State of Minnesota to receive State dollars that we use to lessen both Cities' local match to our federal funds, and the contract is the same as it has been the last couple of years, thus staff is recommending the board approve authorizing the execution of the contract.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING
EXECUTION OF THE 2018 MNDOT STATE PLANNING CONTRACT, AS SUBMITTED.***

Strandell asked if East Grand Forks has a project. He said he can't remember from the ATP meetings if it does. Haugen responded that East Grand Forks has 2018 Sub-Target projects programmed. Strandell asked if there is only one project. Haugen responded that they split their round-about at Rhinehart and Bygland Road into five separate projects. Strandell said that he is referring to enhancement projects. Haugen stated that East Grand Forks did not submit an application for the next rounds of transportation alternatives.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO THE FY2017-2020 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that this is a request from the State of North Dakota, looking at how to improve safety out at U.S.#2 and Airport Road and County 5. He explained that the equipment inside the signal is obsolete and difficult to repair and find replacement parts, so the State is going to spend up to \$60,000 to improve the cabinetry of that signal system and are using federal funds. He added that this is a new project, thus it needs to show up in our T.I.P. document, so we need to amend our 2017-2020 T.I.P. to reflect this project. He said that it will be done next construction season, and the Technical Advisory Committee is recommending this body approve it.

DeMers asked how old the control structure of that signal is. Haugen responded that he doesn't know the exact age, but he does know they have done work on it in the not too distant past, certainly within the last five to ten years.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2017-2020 T.I.P.
AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Malm asked if this is going to prevent these guys from crossing the median and go back to town and run into people. Haugen responded that it is just upgrading the traffic cabinet, it isn't

making any other changes. Malm stated that, when you talk about changing it, the last guy went right across the brick median, and hit someone in the other direction.

Haugen reported that there is a separate likely project that they will do in 2018 that they haven't yet scoped out for us, and they haven't shown what it is that they will do, but there have been meetings, and there is talk about doing an additional effort out and around this intersection to try to improve the safety, but right now the project is to upgrade the equipment inside the cabinet for the traffic signals.

Haugen commented that when and if they ever come to an agreement for the rest of the it, we will see it through a T.I.P. amendment, assuming it will be federally funded. He added, though, that he is sure it won't be a significant project, but will more likely be more signage and stuff like that.

DeMers said then, that this gets put into our T.I.P. at \$60,000; what happens if the bid comes in above that amount. Haugen responded that in a typical process they have the ability to go 25% over what is being programmed, so if it is over 25%, then another amendment would be necessary.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT NORTH DAKOTA FY2018-2021 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that last August this body approved the Minnesota side T.I.P. for these years, but North Dakota was not prepared to do a final S.T.I.P. at that time. He added that, as noted last month, North Dakota did submit a final S.T.I.P. to Federal Highway without going and asking the MPOs to do a final T.I.P, so now we are trying to gain a consistency of what S.T.I.P. year are for both North Dakota and Minnesota, so staff is asking the board to consider adopting the 2018-2021 T.I.P. on the North Dakota side.

Haugen commented that when North Dakota adopted their S.T.I.P. there were some projects that we were asking for funding, that were awarded funds, but they don't appear in the current 2017 T.I.P., so we need to add those projects into a T.I.P. document, and we are doing it with this 2018 document.

Haugen stated that the reason North Dakota didn't approve a S.T.I.P. right away was because of the Main Street Initiative and that they were possibly going to make major changes to the Urban Program, so this T.I.P. document will not have any further projects programmed for FY2021.

Haugen reported that a public hearing was held at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday and they, along with staff, are recommending approval.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Haugen commented that the projects that weren't in the current T.I.P., that are now being included in this T.I.P. are:

1. Grand Forks was awarded TA funding to do a bike/ped facility, so that now shows up in the official document.
2. On 32nd Avenue we were awarded safety dollars to do a lot of intersection improvements in FY2019.

Haugen stated that the only other thing that is new is in North Dakota, in FY2021, out on U.S.#2; starting on 69th Street and going west to the Air Force Base, they are going to do some pavement preservation work. He commented that in the T.I.P. description it tells us that it is the Eastbound Lane. He added that in FY2019 they are doing a project on the Westbound Lane, and in FY2021 they will do the Eastbound Lane project.

Haugen commented that there is one Illustrative Project that Cities Area Transit submitted to FTA. He said that it is an \$8.5 million dollar request to help with the Bus Barn remodel. He added that if they are awarded funds for this project we will have to make an amendment to take it out of the illustrative list and move it into the programmed list.

Haugen reported that every year we have to show a listing of annual obligations; and in it we show what our T.I.P. programmed, and then what was actually obligated to the project. He referred to the list and went over it briefly.

Vein asked, on Highway 2 you talked about a project eastbound/westbound, do you know what those project are. Haugen responded that originally they were potentially going to be a reconstruct/urbanizing of part of the roadway, almost reconstructing the whole stretch; but now it is basically just a mill and overlay. He added that until they actually get into the project development stage it doesn't really tell us exactly what will be done, but this is how they are estimating the cost; this basic work. Vein asked how far it goes, from 69th to the Air Force Base. Haugen responded that one part of the project is a mile further west, essentially to the Air Force Base itself, so from 69th Street, which is two miles east of the Airport Intersection; and then going out ten or eleven miles to the Air Force Base.

DeMers pointed out that it states "Funding is Pending", and then construction in FY2019. Haugen explained that North Dakota, at the end of every federal fiscal year there are some states across the nation that actually don't spend all of their obligation authority, so then it gets redistributed and North Dakota receives some additional money, so they will use projects that are actually in the next year of construction, but they bid them the year before to obligate those redistributed federal funds. He stated, though, that the kind of string the feds attached on this is "we'll give you more federal dollars but you have to obligate them real fast". He added that if they don't get enough redistributed money to cover, they had several projects listed this way, then it will be funded out of their FY2019 dollars.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF
THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FY2018-2021 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

Haugen commented that, just to finalize this listing of annual obligations, another reason why we do it, and are required to do it is, when we are working on our transportation plan and have to give a financial forecast, we can look at what we thought we were getting versus what was actually obligated; and in most cases we were estimating low in the programming side and were getting more funds, so that helps us with our fiscal constraint issue.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA FY2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Vein stated that we will go through each of the items individually, but will we have one motion to approve them all or separate approvals as well. Haugen reported that the first two agenda items require approval, the last two are for information only.

Haugen commented that, just having approved our 2018-2021 T.I.P., we begin the process of deciding what could be in our 2019-2022 T.I.P. He stated that several months ago we solicited for the Transportation Alternative Program and the Highway Safety Improvement Program. Mr. Viafara will walk us through what we got on the Transportation Alternative side, and what the staff and Technical Advisory Committee recommendation is.

a. Transportation Alternative (TA) Projects

Viafara reported that you received a staff report in your packets that aligns the four projects that were submitted by the City of Grand Forks. He explained that in order to keep things short, the emphasis will be on the first two projects listed; 17th Avenue South from South 25th Street to South 20th Street and University Avenue from the Mobile Home Park Entrance to North 48th Street.

Viafara commented that because the state government has set a cap of \$290,000 for T.A. projects, if either of these two are approved, that will be the amount received by the City.

Viafara stated that these projects are important because they help us to complete the bicycle and pedestrian network, and also to improve safety for the users, particularly children and youth.

Viafara reported that in the past the City has been awarded, in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016, Transportation Alternative funding for their projects, so we know that one of these projects will be awarded funding again this year.

Vein asked if there is a possibility of both projects receiving funding, or just one. Haugen responded that there is a possibility of having both receive funding, however it is competing statewide, and there is typically three times the requests than funding available. He added that they do honor our priorities, so what we list as number one is what they will most likely consider as our top funded project.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE
TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE CANDIDATE PROJECTS SUBMITTED FOR THE
FY2019-2022 T.I.P. AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE
TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS LISTED.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

b. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Projects

Haugen reported that this is the program in which safety funds are identified and awarded to projects.

Haugen stated that we solicited our member jurisdictions on the North Dakota side and received two applications, both from the City of Grand Forks.

Haugen pointed out that the first one is Grand Forks' top priority project to replace essentially all of the school crossing beacons in Grand Forks. He referred to a map showing all of the locations of these beacons, and went over it briefly, stating that there are 22 total beacons that are being requested be upgraded.

Haugen commented that they currently have a set clock, so the upgrade would allow for dynamic timing so that when school has changes in their schedule, the beacons can be changed easily to coincide with the school's actual timing change.

Haugen stated that the third component is proposing that they allow people to actuate these signals. He explained that currently people cannot change them to start flashing, this project, if awarded, would allow that to happen.

Haugen reported that the final cost of the project is just over \$700,000, the federal participation would be just over \$600,000.

Haugen stated that the second project, the City is requesting to essentially install a new traffic signal on 32nd Avenue/17th Street Intersection, however, the NDDOT does not use these funds to install new traffic signals, so we are recommending you declare this an ineligible item to move forward.

Vein asked if these were in ranked order as well, so our number one priority project remains the number one priority. Haugen responded they are. Vein asked, again, if there was a possibility of having two projects funded. Haugen responded that this is a little more unique program where we've had multiple applications funded, it is just that our second project is ineligible to get funding from this program.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Vein asked if Mr. Haugen could explain the ineligibility issue, that it is new construction. Haugen responded that this is a new traffic signal, and the NDDOT is not funding new traffic signals through this program. He added that they will fund lane offsets, and adding yellow flashing arrows, or modification of traffic signals, but they will not fund a brand new traffic signal from this program, and that is what the second project is doing. He commented that there were some other components to this project, like including the left turn offset at this intersection, but the majority of the cost was with the traffic signal, and after discussing it with City Staff they felt that that was the project the City approved, so that was the project that had to be considered in totality, and to not try to break it down to what was eligible versus what wasn't, and the majority of it is ineligible, so the project is ineligible.

Malm asked about the need for all of these beacons in light of the discussions going on about closing some of the schools in Grand Forks. Haugen responded that this gets the dollars programmed, but it will be a couple of years before the monies are actually available, and if the school system is on the timetable they have indicated, we have up to the award to spend so that will allow us to not have to spend all of the money that is available, so there is time to react before we have to spend these monies as to what schools are open what are closed, what signals can stay in place, what signals need to be replaced, etc.

Malm asked how long of a time period was this, two years. Haugen asked if he was referring to the school decision on closures. Malm responded that that is what he was referring to, adding that it might take twenty years to decide. Haugen stated that he thought they were on a short timeline to make that decision, but it is a political decision as well, so there will be a lot of input. Vein commented that we can't not doing anything until that decision is made because who knows when or if it will ever be made. Haugen added that these funds might not be available until 2022.

DeMers you talked about that the traffic signals were not eligible, can this be brought back, or petitioned from the City to be brought back as just the lane changes and sidewalk changes. Haugen responded that he had that conversation with City staff and they felt that they didn't want to do that, that the council adopted the total project.

Kuharenko reported that, overall, the traffic signal portion of that project was about 2/3 to 3/4 of the total cost of the project, so trying to go for federal funds for a much reduced scope of the project didn't make a whole lot of sense. He added that he believes that in their CIP, they actually have a budgeted line item for that intersection with a signal, so getting in there and doing a signal, and doing it as two separate projects doesn't make sense.

DeMers commented that his thought was that maybe it is cheaper to do it as two separate projects because you are leveraging federal funding, and getting any portion of the project paid for would be beneficial. Vein said that they have done that on other projects, such as the corner of 17th and Columbia Road, which was divided into two separate projects, one being a State project and one a Federal project, which made sense even though you disrupt the intersection twice. DeMers added that he was just thinking that even if you get 1/3 of a project covered by federal funds, it would be worth it. Haugen explained that some of the other improvements

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

would be recommended only if a new signal was being installed at that intersection, and it is a State Highway, so the City and the State would have to work out whether they would fund a signal on a State Highway or not.

Haugen reported that the recommendation is that the top ranked project remains the top priority, and that is the school beacons, and that the second project be deemed ineligible and not forwarded.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVMENT PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECT TO UPGRADE THE SCHOOL CROSSING BEACONS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO DEEM THE NEW TRAFFIC SIGNAL PROJECT AT 32ND AND 17TH AS AN INELIGIBLE PROJECT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

c. Urban Roads Program

Haugen reported that normally we would be considering projects for the Urban Program, but as we discussed with the last T.I.P. agenda item, North Dakota, at the time was not prepared to solicit until the Main Street Initiative was figured out. He pointed out that we will actually be discussing the Main Street Initiative next on the agenda.

Haugen commented that one of the big funding sources for the Main Street Initiative was going to be from the Urban Program. He explained that originally, after the FAST act, we were told that our funding estimate was going to increase per year, but the Main Street Initiative was proposed to take 50% of the monies from the Urban Program, but in the end it is only taking \$1 million state-wide and is taking dollars from other programs, so our funding will now be less than what we originally were told, but more than what we were getting pre-FAST.

Haugen stated that now that the funding for the Main Street Initiative has been determined, we are now formally soliciting for the Urban Roads Program, and announcements have gone out to the jurisdictions. He said that the applications are due by February 6th, so at your February meeting you will be looking at candidate projects from the North Dakota Urban Program and their Regional Program, so the City and the District Office will be submitting projects.

Vein asked if he heard correctly that the projects will be submitted from the City of Grand Forks and the Local NDDOT District Office. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained that there are actually two sub-programs out of the Urban Program; the Urban Local and the Urban Regional. He said that the local ones are the local streets like Columbia Road, 17th Avenue South, etc.; and the regional ones are the State Highways like DeMers Avenue, Washington Street, 32nd Avenue South, etc.. He added that the City is responsible for preparing the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

applications and they need to get signatures from the NDDOT District Engineer for regional projects, and then we need to vet them through the City Council, and this needs to be done by February 2nd.

Vein asked Mr. Kuharenko if these applications are in the pipeline for council approval. Kuharenko responded that it is. He explained that they will be looking at submitting it to the Committee of the Whole the last meeting in January, and then to the City Council the first meeting in February.

Haugen referred to the staff report and commented that, annually the distribution of funds to the MPO is estimated at about \$2.4 million dollars to \$2.7 million dollars, and every year that we don't have a project awarded monies in Grand Forks to utilize that NDDOT accounts for the imbalance by allowing the Urban Cities to "borrow" from each other in any given year. He pointed out that in 2018 and 2019 our projects are getting more awarded to them than what is annually targeted; and 2020 we will be allowing other cities to borrow from us so therefore we have a balance of only \$1 million dollars, and then again in 2021 we have a project that is more than what we are allocated so we will be borrowing from the other cities. He added that Grand Forks County has this as well, where the counties allow each other to borrow from each other, and last year Grand Forks County borrowed monies to be able to do all the mill and overlays they did over the last couple of years.

Haugen stated that they also gave us what 2021 projects they are actually going to program; again in the 2018-2021 T.I.P. there were no 2021 projects identified, but now that the Main Street Initiative has been decided, they were willing to tell us that our request to have North Columbia Road reconstructed just north of the overpass has been programmed and in 2021 they are setting aside \$4.5 million dollars of federal funds for that project. He added that we also asked for the Washington Street Underpass to be reconstructed in 2021, and they are saying that because it is such a massive project, 2021 doesn't quite fit but that they are willing to program it in 2022, so now we know that on the regional side in 2022 our big ticket item is preliminarily programmed already.

Haugen commented that another interesting thing is, when this first came out, is that University Avenue showed up in the 2019 year, but we had asked for it in 2020. He explained that it is showing up in 2019 sort of like the project out on U.S. #2 west of town, it might get some monies at the end of 2019, but it will be a project that is bid late in 2019 and constructed in 2020, and City staff is comfortable with that arrangement.

Kuharenko reported that one of the main reasons why we are looking at University Avenue being constructed in 2020 instead of 2019, where they currently have it programmed, is because of the Main Street Initiative. He said that right now they are currently discussing UND's English Coulee/Columbia concept to see if we might be able to incorporate some of those into a Main Street Initiative Program and application.

Kuharenko stated that they did end up having some conversations with the NDDOT as to the DeMers Avenue project, which he believes is in that same time frame that was solicited. Vein

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

asked if this was DeMers Avenue in the downtown area. Kuharenko responded that that is correct. He added, however, that that project is currently underway and we are not going to have to put in a separate application for that, it would just be a request, particularly because we have already have brick pavers downtown, and we already have ornamental street lights, so we don't have to apply for them as part of the Main Street Initiative project, but we will need to request them during the design process.

Information only.

d. Main Street Initiative

Haugen reported that there is \$4.6 million dollars available, the original proposal was \$8 million dollars. He explained that when they had to squeeze the money they were only able to squeeze \$4.6 million dollars.

Haugen stated that there is a program for the smaller cities in the State of North Dakota, very similar to the proposed Main Street Initiative Program, and it has up to \$3.6 million dollars, however they don't program that full amount every year, so there could be an additional \$3.6 million dollars added to the \$4.6 million dollars available so each year the NDDOT Director will make a decision as to how much to fund, but the minimum will be the \$4.6 million dollars.

Haugen commented that we are formally soliciting projects for this program and the deadline is the same February 6th date as for the Urban Roads Program.

Haugen stated that, just to remind you what the projects are that they are looking for, are things that add transportation choices to the project; things that improve transit service, improve bike/ped facilities along the corridor to make the area livable, road diets are potential, other traffic calming measures are potentially eligible, so what they are really trying to do is to have agencies think out of their traditional boxes and they are almost inviting people to put them to task to determine whether things are truly eligible or not from a federal perspective, so hopefully the projects are really trying to take advantage of all these things that are eligible. He added that this is a statewide competition, and one thing the Director did was, he originally proposed a selection committee, but in the end he decided to make a blanket statement that each year he will make a decision on who serves on the selection committee instead of listing the agencies represented, so we aren't sure of the composition of who will be making the recommendation, but we do know these are the things they are looking for to make things competitive to the projects.

Malm asked what a road diet is. Haugen responded that when you take something like South Washington, south of DeMers, where it is essentially viewed as five lanes, two in each direction and one center turn lane, and you cut it down to one lane in each direction and keep the center turn lane; and the other two lanes either become bike lanes, or parking lanes, or transit lanes, they are repurposed to be something other than vehicle through lanes. He added that they are finding that traffic actually improves with this setup.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Haugen reported that the last thing on this initiative is, again, the original focus was to try to revitalize, reinvest, redevelop downtowns, so initially they asked what would be considered the focus area, and so this is what was submitted for mapping purposes, but they are acknowledging that projects don't necessarily have to be in this highlighted area, projects in other areas would be considered as well. He said, though, that the only thing they definitely won't consider, if we are talking about projects, are those that are on the edge, and are totally new construction or are converting rural to urban, or in other words, sprawl.

Vein commented that a mid-town library location could get incorporated into this should there ever be one. Haugen agreed that it could, but, again, with statewide competition he isn't sure if they give preferential treatment automatically to things that are inside the boxes or not, but if you make a strong competitive case anywhere in the currently developed area of Grand Forks it should be an eligible project.

Vein asked who made the determination of the study area. Haugen responded that City staff made that determination. Kuharenko commented that originally the limits were actually a lot smaller than what is shown, actually stopping at North 5th Street and Kittson, originally, so they actually managed to expand it out to get 3rd, 4th, and 5th all the way up to Gateway Drive, and also those same streets down to Minnesota Avenue as well.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Contract Amendment #1

Haugen reported that most of these are information only items, but the first item does need a motion from this body. He explained that in November we had the special meeting and a motion was made and approved to ask MPO Staff to get a cost estimate to look at what it would take to do the additional analysis for these five river crossings. He stated that included in the packet is the scope-of-work that was drafted by our consultant with a cost estimate. He said that it was distributed to local staff and State staff for review and comment prior to the Technical Advisory Committee consideration last week. He said that Kimley-Horn is estimating their costs to be just over \$20,000 to do the work. He commented that, also included, in addition to Kimley-Horn's work, is an estimate for work done by A.T.A.C. to do a traffic model work as well, and that estimate is just over \$4,500; so the motion before you is to approve allowing the MPO to execute the contract for Kimley-Horn to do this additional work and for A.T.A.C. to run additional travel demand models at a total cost of around \$25,000. He added that both City Administrators indicated that neither City has a problem with the local match needed to do this work, and that the cost to each City is around \$2,000.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH KIMLEY-HORN TO COMPLETE AN ANALYSIS OF THE FIVE PROPOSED RIVER CROSSINGS; AND WITH A.T.A.C. TO RUN A TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL ANALYSIS FOR THE FIVE PROPOSED RIVER CROSSINGS, AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$25,000.00.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Strandell commented that he will be voting no on this motion as he does not think that 17th and 24th Avenues should be studied further. He stated that they have been studied in the past and eliminated, and why they came up now again is beyond him. Malm said that he concurs with what Mr. Strandell said because you can restudy it and restudy it and it doesn't do you any good and you create a bigger political argument every time you do it. Powers stated that he is inclined to agree, adding that he thinks we should focus on 32nd, 47th, and Merrifield.

Vein said that the motion that was approved by this body at the special meeting was to look at all five locations. Powers responded that that is correct, but in talking with Mr. Strandell and Mr. Malm, he feels that they have point, that it is kind of redundant. Strandell added that 17th and

24th are not viable options, they are residential. Powers agreed, especially from an East Grand Forks perspective, we have to look further south.

Haugen commented that this is certainly different than what the Technical Advisory Committee has been discussing; and the motion from the Special Meeting was to get the cost estimates to do all five of the locations, and that is what we've done.

Vein stated that, personally, he can understand exactly what you are talking about; he doesn't expect them to be finalists after the analysis is complete, but what it does is it gets us up-to-date information on all of them at the same level based on the same criteria so we aren't comparing one location to another location based on previous traffic counts and population compared to what we have today. He said that he is hoping we can, the idea is to be more definitive in where we think we should be planning for that southend bridge, and his concept is that this would be data that would maybe put this to rest and not have the questions keep arising, and that is why he voted to have all five locations studied.

DeMers asked if the cost estimate broke out a per crossing amount. Haugen responded that it did not. DeMers said that they could be charging \$19,000 to do the study and \$200 for each crossing so will we really save anything by eliminating those two locations. Haugen responded that there would be some savings, but what that is exactly he isn't sure so he would have to renegotiate with Kimley-Horn and A.T.A.C.

Haugen stated that one thing he would throw out there is that as we go and talk to the public, if we don't have any information for these two locations we will probably get a strong push from people demanding to know what those are, particularly as these 32nd and 47th neighborhoods start to see the impact on them, they would obviously be trying to deflect the impact to other areas in town, so there will be a push to try to identify why you dropped them off without any information.

Powers asked if there wasn't some documentation from previous discussions on 17th Avenue. Haugen responded that we certainly have documentation, but all that is based on old land use growth assumptions, and so the numbers aren't apples to apples comparisons anymore, even with the I-29 Study numbers we got, as those numbers aren't going to be the result for the 32nd option with this contract amendment, the numbers will change because, again, both Cities changed their growth assumptions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Vetter commented that the current contract we have with Kimley-Horn already included 32nd and Merrifield, so the amendment is to just add 17th, 24th, and 47th. He stated that 47th we just added because Dana Sande suggested we include it, recognizing that it is too south for East Grand Forks to benefit from it. Powers agreed that that is what Mr. Sande said, but he still thinks the other two are redundant.

Vetter asked if we would have enough ammunition without the additional two or three intersections in there to argue that 32nd is the appropriate place for an additional bridge.

Vein said, again, Amendment #1 is worded after the motion that was made at our special meeting, so we have already made the motion to do this, so is there a need for another motion to redo what we have already said we would do. Haugen responded that we need a motion to execute the contract amendment. Vein said, then, that this is the amendment to do the motion that we already passed. Haugen responded that it is actually to authorize the payment for the additional work.

Malm commented that he truly thinks it is a waste of money to do 17th and 24th, it doesn't make any sense to anybody on the Grand Forks side. He said that you would be going right through the heart of a neighborhood, who is going to pay for it. Vetter responded that he agrees, but added that it is just that we need the ammunition so that when the public comes and says to put it on 24th, we can explain to them why we can't put on 24th. Malm said that he understands what Mr. Vetter is saying, but added that they discussed this yesterday at the County, and with one dissenting vote they are going to look at putting aside money to look at the Merrifield Road project. He added that he knows it doesn't work for East Grand Forks, but maybe in the end it is just that we need to look at another place between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, another bridge, but you have this other thing, is that you are studying things that you studied. He said that he sat through every meeting that has ever been done about a bridge in this town, except the original bridge, and nobody can make up their mind where they want it to be and the City developed and you've got to get one far enough out of the whole way to allow that to take place, and then have the Cities decide which neighborhood they want to run it through. He suggested getting someone to build a toll-bridge; all the rich people on both sides of the river live south of 24th. DeMers commented that 24th is actually south of East Grand Forks. Malm said, though, that that is where the rich people in East Grand Forks are going to go. He stated that he just can't believe that 24th makes any sense because it goes right through a major neighborhood. DeMers pointed out that 32nd and 47th do as well. Malm disagreed stating that 32nd could be but it is less of a residential neighborhood, 24th is a residential neighborhood. He asked if anyone knew of any residents that want to have a thoroughfare right in front of their house. DeMers commented, though, that this is designed as a local residential bridge; adding that it is exactly like 4th, and that goes right through a residential neighborhood, and the school sits right there. Malm said that he understands that, but that happens to be there already; why would you put another one in the middle of a residential area. DeMers responded that it is residential from the Downtown, as far south as you can go, so it will have to go through a residential area. Strandell stated that 32nd isn't a residential neighborhood. DeMers said that it is residential all the way up to South Washington it is.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Malm asked how many blocks of residential there is on 32nd. Vein responded that if he remembers right it is about a mile of residential. He added that the thing about this is, they have had this discussion before that between Belmont Road and at least over to Washington there is residential in every one of these cases, so the only way to avoid it would be to go to Merrifield. DeMers agreed, but added that, again, that is too far for East Grand Forks. Vein added that 47th is probably too far south, so he doesn't know what will make the most sense. DeMers stated that that is why we want to do the study. Malm asked, though, what are those guys going to study and tell us. Vetter responded that that is a good question because all they are going to study is the traffic patterns. Malm said that he is just going to say this, because he won't be here long, he is done with this one, he has gone to every meeting for years and heard the same arguments, but as soon as you go through a residential area you are going to have people up in arms. Vetter stated that he would anticipate that the study is going to show that if you put a bridge at 32nd you are going to alleviate traffic off of Belmont and Reeves; if you put it at 24th or 17th you will alleviate traffic off of Belmont and Reeves down to that street and then it will stay on Belmont all the way to 32nd yet.

Malm commented that, first of all what you need to do is to improve, to get it off of Belmont and Reeves, is you improve that area that goes to the Point Bridge. Vetter disagreed, stating that you need to put a bridge at 32nd. He said that he can tell you that everyone that he knows says: "screw em, I'm driving down Belmont and Reeves until I get a bridge at 32nd Avenue", they don't go over to Washington and go down to 32nd. Malm asked what kind of a bridge are you going to build. Vetter responded, a tall one so it is out of the flood plain. Malm commented that if you go out of the flood plain you are going to have to figure that you are going to have to go at least five or six blocks, so you have a long ways to get over the flood plain, and then you are going to have a negative effect. Vetter stated that the feds are talking about infrastructure, so we have to get our ducks in a row because there will be money available on the federal side for infrastructure. Malm said that he doesn't believe that, adding that they promise all these things, but if infrastructure was really big in their mind the first thing they would put under their agenda would be infrastructure, not what they did now. He added that they are going to have to find some way to pay for some of these other things that we have now.

Powers asked what the estimated cost of a bridge at 32nd was. Strandell responded that it was \$25 million for just a local traffic bridge; and \$50 million if it is a high and dry bridge. Powers asked how far that goes. Strandell responded that he doesn't know. Haugen commented that it varies based on location. He referred to a map of the area and pointed out that where the flood protection is, the dike system, it is closer at 24th, but when you get to 32nd it is farther apart, as it is at 17th; so if we talk high and dry the distances are different for each location, but generally you are in the \$20 to \$25 million and doubling that for one that is high and dry, although there is a question as to whether or not those numbers are still good, but those are based off of the 2001 plan.

Strandell commented that he doesn't know how you can justify a \$50 million dollar bridge just to cover maybe a one to two week period, because you can buy about three helicopters. Vetter responded that it does if Altru moves its hospital to the southend of Grand Forks. Strandell stated that a helicopter will accomplish the same thing. He said, again, that it is only one or two weeks when a high and dry bridge might be needed, so he can't justify that kind of expense. He added that he doesn't need to go over to the Columbia Mall every week.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Vein stated that he understands what Mr. Strandell is saying, but that will be a different discussion at a different time. He said that what we need to do today is to figure out what this amendment needs to look like, we had a motion that said that we were going to support these five locations, that has already passed, and now we want to amend the contract to support the motion we have already done.

Vein commented that, if the motion made fails, we have two locations already identified, we just won't do any additional locations. Haugen agreed, adding that there would not be a contract amendment for additional work, we would just go with the locations we originally scoped out. Vein said that those locations would be 32nd and Merrifield. Strandell stated that he wouldn't be opposed to have 47th Avenue studied.

DeMers asked, what if he amended his motion to include 24th, 32nd, 47th, and Merrifield. Vein said that Mr. Vetter would need to agree to that amendment. Vetter said that he would be fine with that amendment.

MOTION, AS AMENDED READS: MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH KIMLEY-HORN TO COMPLETE AN ANALYSIS OF FOUR PROPOSED BRIDGE LOCATIONS AT 24TH, 32ND, 47TH, AND MERRIFIELD, AND WITH A.T.A.C. TO RUN A TRAVEL DEMAND MODEL ANALYSIS FOR THOSE SAME FOUR LOCATIONS.

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

Voting Nay: Strandell and Malm.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

Vein stated that Mr. Haugen will also need to go back and renegotiate the contracts with Kimley-Horn and A.T.A.C. to reflect this change.

Malm commented that it is going to cost us just as much money. He added that he isn't concerned, but the fact is that you can study every block all the way down the line and it isn't going to cost a whole lot more to do that. Haugen stated that a lot of the money is for preparing graphics for each of the individual locations, so each one was almost a fifth of the cost, so if we drop one location out of the five we can assume at least a fifth of the cost being dropped, so that would drop this estimate down to somewhere around \$16,000 or \$17,000, so if you want to just consider authorizing up to an amount, that would allow us to keep this moving forward and we don't need to come back for approval of a dollar amount, maybe capping it at around \$20,000.00.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE MPO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO RENEGOTIATE THE CONTRACT TERMS NOT TO EXCEED \$22,000.00.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

Haugen reported that he inadvertently left off one step, and that is to amend our work program to include this amendment into our work activities in 2018.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AMENDING THE 2017-2018 ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM TO ADD THIS INTO OUR WORK ACTIVITY IN 2018.

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

Voting Nay: Malm.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mock and Grasser.

b. Goals/Objectives/Standards

Haugen reported that included in the packet were the edited versions showing what was removed and what was added to our goals/objectives/standards. He said that a lot of it was rewording and shifting some sections into one of the two new goals.

Haugen stated that this was given to the Technical Advisory to review until mid-January. He said that at Technical Advisory Committee meeting they discussed that what we were doing on the Safety Goal 8 was adding a lot of the language from the Strategic Highway Safety Plan and the Local Safety Plan as to what they are saying they are trying to achieve with safety dollars, so that we had to integrate those safety documents into our Long Range Transportation Plan to allow the lines of safety funds to be programmed into our T.I.P. document, so there is quite a bit of additional language added to the goals.

Vein asked if Mr. Haugen and his staff put this together and have taken it to the Technical Advisory Committee, and are now bringing it to the board, but you've taken what you interpret or see as those changes incorporated into this document. Haugen responded that that is correct, that staff and the consultants put this together, and now we are asking for the review and comment period on the draft.

Information only.

c. Safety Performance Measures

Haugen commented that this is our monthly information on where we are at with the individual Safety Performance Measures.

Haugen referred to the packet, and explained that they have gone through the data driven analysis to identify that if the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks MPO were to adopt an MPO target instead of both State Targets, what is the number we would suggest.

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

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

d. 2030-2045 E & C Loaded Network

Haugen stated that we now have the results of our 2030 Travel Demand model and our 2045 Travel Demand model. He pointed out that the maps of these are included in the file, adding that as we grow, what we are doing here is we are not trying to show, yet, what happens if we get another bridge, or if we add through lanes at any of our existing roadways, just what our growth is, and what it does to our existing system with the improvements we already know that are in our T.I.P. projects.

Haugen commented that we can see the traffic still wants to go on our major arterials, but we do start seeing, when we look at the volumes to capacity ratio that we start getting more areas where we have more volume and then the road is capable of carrying. He added that in 2045 there are more roadways that are over capacity. He reported that there is a website where you can go in and review what the actual numbers are for each segment for all three years of the model, 2015, 2030, and 2045.

Information only.

e. Open House

Haugen reported that there was an open house that took place on December 14th here in East Grand Forks at which information included in the packet was displayed. He said that the only new thing that you haven't seen or been a party of before is that they have gone in and asked people to help us identify what their financial priorities are, where they would place their dollars, and so they gave them a theoretical budget and asked them to use an online tool to identify how much they would put into the six categories shown, so this is giving us some sense of what the public would be telling us where they want to invest the dollars that might be available within the components of our system.

Haugen stated that this is an online activity that is currently in place on the website that was launched at the open house last Thursday.

Vein commented that, again with that obviously it is not a scientific poll, so it is information we are getting from only a small number of people, so it is that small number of people's opinions, it isn't necessarily a city-wide opinion of how we should be doing things.

Haugen stated that they are trying to advertise this tool through all of our connections in both cities to try to get a larger cross-section of the population to review and do the activity. Vein said, though, that somehow it would be nice to be able to compare some of these to what people are really wanting.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2017 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen stated that Mr. Viafara's updated table giving you the status of the 2017 projects was included in the packet.

b. Bill Listing For 11/10/17 to 12/8/17 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the November 10, 2017 to December 8, 2017 period was included in the packet.

c. Minnesota Corridor Of Commerce Solicitation

Haugen reported that the State of Minnesota is about to roll out their Corridor of Commerce solicitation. He said that the State Legislature set aside \$400 million dollars for projects to help corridors of commerce, which are essentially State Highways or project adjacent to or connected to a State Highway, to make transportation improvements.

Haugen stated that this solicitation will be out in January, so hopefully there are some projects on the Minnesota side that are applied for and awarded funding.

Information only.

d. County Study On Merrifield Bridge

Malm reported that Grand Forks County Commission, yesterday, approved for the County Highway Engineer to do a study on constructing a bridge at Merrifield. He commented that this would be a bridge that would be financed between North Dakota, Minnesota, Grand Forks County, and Polk County.

Malm stated that they are going to set aside, if he comes back with information to increase their mill levy by 3 mills, and in eight years there will be enough money to pay the County's portion of the cost to construct the bridge.

Vein said, then, that Grand Forks County is taking the lead on that. He asked if they had discussed this with their Minnesota counterparts. Strandell responded that Polk County is on board with it, but they have not committed any funds at this time. Malm stated that they haven't committed any funds either, but they are trying to look at a way to move this forward, and want to have a financial plan in place if a decision were to be made to construct a bridge at Merrifield.

Malm commented that this was not a unanimous decision, they had one person vote against it, but it wasn't him. He said that they just felt that someone had to take this by the horn and start moving down the road because once it is determined where it is going to go, then you have to figure out how you are going to pay for it and what kind of a bridge you want. He added that this would be a bridge that would be above flood stage, and that basically takes care of rural transportation and others in that area, but if they can't find anyone to go along with it, then it will

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, December 20th, 2017**

be a dead issue, but in any event the County is looking forward and will be setting aside money.

Vein asked if the study would be doing traffic counts and all of that. Malm responded that they are leaving that up to the engineer. Vein asked if they would be doing cost and alignment. Malm responded that they picked a spot and they will look at all of those questions. He added that the County Highway Engineer will develop the idea of what to do. Vein asked if this information would be brought back to the Executive Board. Malm responded it would.

Information only.

e. Executive Director Evaluation

Vein reported that last month Mr. Haugen talked to him about doing his performance evaluation, and the process, and he is going to do that but he would welcome any feedback this body has so he can get it incorporated into the evaluation. He added that this is a little bit different, as he put some thought into it, than other departments in that Mr. Haugen actually answers to more of a board and elected person and not a civil servant. He stated that he does this on one of his other boards, the Garrison Diversion, where he just gave up the chair where everybody actually submitted an evaluation, only to him, so he would appreciate some type of feedback on this. He said that he tried to run off the evaluation on his computer, but he wasn't able to do it, so he doesn't know if anyone is interested in the actual evaluation form, but if you are we will get a copy to you, and then he would expect that feedback because he will want to fill out the evaluation.

Vein stated that he will try to just look at what is happening, what is going well, what needs improvement, and he is hoping it can be a positive process and it is nice to get the feedback. He asked if there was a timeline in place for this. Haugen responded that typically it is the end of the year. Vein asked if it were to go longer would it upset the process any. Haugen responded that it would work, it is tied into the pay rate for the 2018 year, so as many pay periods it delays into 2018, depending on the outcome, Peggy would just have to go back and recalculate the pay difference. Vein said it would need to be retroactive. McNelis said that the first payroll isn't until the second week of January so there is a little time left before to maybe get it done and get the information entered into Quickbooks.

DeMers asked if the form could be e-mailed to everyone. Haugen responded that there is a form and he would e-mail to the board.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 20TH, 2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:29 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager