

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

**Wednesday, January 17th, 2018 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the January 17th, 2018, 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: Al Grasser, Jeannie Mock, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, and Ken Vein.

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; Jairo Viafara, 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 DECEMBER 20TH, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

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

Vetter pointed out that there were some members of the board absent at the December 20th, 2017 meeting and they are not shown as such in the minutes.

MOTION, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF LIST OF MEMBERS ABSENT, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE

Haugen reported that normally this would be the time that we would see the Minnesota Candidate projects for our T.I.P.; however, as noted in the staff report there are not MnDOT or Polk County projects. He said that, as a reminder, MnDOT does still have programmed improvements out at U.S.#2 and U.S.Bus#2 intersection in 2021, so there is that one MnDOT project, there just isn't anything for next year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

Haugen commented that every four years East Grand Forks receives City Sub-Target funds, and 2018 they were to receive those funds and they originally had programmed a roundabout at Bygland and Rhinehart, but then decided to amend it out and delay it until 2022, which is when they are scheduled to receive the City Sub-Target funds again.

Haugen pointed out that included in the application for the roundabout at Bygland and Rhinehart; they have updated the nomination form that needs to be filled out, there wasn't too much information that needed to be changed on it, although they did update the cost estimate to reflect 2022 year of expenditure. He stated that in comparing this to the original 2018 estimate on the nomination form they are within \$6,000 of each other.

Haugen said that included in the packet was a more current concept drawing of the roundabout as well. He commented that it was originally scoped as a compact roundabout, meaning the diameter would be less than 90-feet; the current concept shows the diameter as being 120-feet, thus brought up to a more modern roundabout design concept.

Haugen stated that, again, this is the only application we have for consideration on the Minnesota side for candidate projects for the 2019-2022 T.I.P. He added that it is consistent with the MPOs transportation plans, and is our top priority.

Haugen said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO staff recommend you approve it and forward it on to the A.T.P.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.

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

Voting Nay: Strandell and Powers.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #2 TO THE ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that a while back staff informed the board that, due to some grant issues, the NDDOT utilized 2014 federal funding for most of our 2017 calendar year billings, and that then freed up our 2017 funds, thus we have requested our jurisdictions to nominate work activities for those 2017 funds.

Haugen stated that last month this body approved \$22,000 out of these available funds for the additional river crossings analysis. He said that this month the City of East Grand Forks is submitting a request for us to assist them with their ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan.

Haugen commented that included in the packet is the amendment, with a total budgeted amount of \$50,000; with \$35,000 for possible consultant assistance on it. He pointed out that the actual write-up is highlighted in yellow on the table under Special Studies.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

Haugen reported that this is a requirement of ADA since its inception back in the early 1990s; however Minnesota and the Federal Highway Administration in Minnesota are placing greater emphasis on progression of making the right-of-way fully accessible for those with disabilities, and so they have given the Minnesota jurisdictions that receive federal transportation funds until the end of 2019 to have up-to-date transition plans established, so East Grand Forks is in the process of addressing their plan and are asking us for help with their right-of-way area. He added that East Grand Forks will, on their own, have to do their own buildings and other facilities, we will just be assisting them in their right-of-way.

Haugen stated that other MPOs across the State of Minnesota are also assisting their jurisdictions, so the dollar value is based more on what the FM/Cog and the City of Moorhead are doing together, jointly, on their ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan. He said that if you look at the square mileage on both communities, East Grand Forks is roughly a third of that, and that is the same with the population figures, so we took a third of their contracted amount and used that as our budget scope for their study.

Haugen referred to the financial table, and pointed out that we are now, with this amendment and the previous amendment, budgeting \$100,000 of the \$300,000+ of the 2017 funds available, so we still have the capability of several additional studies that may come to us during the 2018 year, but we do need approval of this body to amend the work program to identify this work activity to be done so that next month we can move forward with a detailed scope-of-work, and then to decide if we want to pursue an RFP for the consultant selection, or because of the value we are budgeting we could go a different route if we want.

MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.

Vein asked, there is money remaining, is there anything on the forefront of what additional studying may be needed in East Grand Forks this calendar year. Haugen responded that they aren't aware of anything pending on the East Grand Forks side. He added, however, that the funds that are available aren't only for Minnesota efforts, they are available for both sides of the river. Vein said, then, that we aren't seeing anything for either side at this point. Haugen commented that they did have some conversations, since we are doing the right-of-way transition plan for one side of the river, if the other side wants assistance or not. He said that he doesn't know if the Grand Forks City staff has considered that or not.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR 2018 AERIAL PHOTOS

Haugen reported that Ms. Kouba had to participate in a North Dakota Transit meeting so was unable to be here today to speak on this item, therefore he will do so.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

Haugen stated that every three years we do an update of our aerial photos. He said that this RFP follows a required format and is very similar to what we did three years ago. He referred to a map and pointed out the area that will be covered, adding that it isn't just the city-proper, as we do go out over our entire MPO study area.

Haugen commented that the amount we had budgeted in our work program is \$45,000, so we have \$42,000 for consultant costs.

Haugen reported that if we receive approval today we will still have to go through the NDDOT's qualification base selection process, which will allow us to have consideration of a final contract in March, and hopefully that will allow us to have the area flown prior to the trees leafing out in mid-April or early May, and then by fall we will get the final product from the vendor.

Vein asked if you want to do the photos when the leaves are off the trees, so you do it either early spring or late fall. Haugen responded that late fall is very tricky because most trees have different schedules for when they lose their leaves, but in the spring most trees don't yet have their leaves at the same time, so spring is the preferred time. He added that also try to do it with the least amount of snow being on the ground, and the least amount of flooding if there is any.

Powers asked how far south they will be flying. Haugen responded that it is essentially just past Merrifield Road, so we include all of the Merrifield corridor; a full mile and a half past Merrifield.

DeMers asked if there was any chance, and this may be for the county representatives, of coordinating this with the counties, do you know what the counties schedule are for their photogrammetry, because he is wondering if we want to see what the counties are doing, and what their schedules are because, obviously we have a limit as to what we are going to spend, but if we can do three projects at once maybe we could get a reduction in cost. Strandell commented that he doesn't know what Polk County's plan is, but he will find out. Haugen said that he believes that Ms. Kouba tried to coordinate this with our Technical Advisory Committee members, which include the county representatives. He added that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting the Polk County Representative was not there, but the Grand Forks County Representative indicated that they were fine with this schedule, and this study area.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee also had a lot of discussion about LiDAR, and whether or not we want to do that as well, but the consensus was that there are other resources available that provide LiDAR so we aren't going with that option. DeMers commented that this is a valuable resource, not just for the MPO, but a lot of other entities use it as well. Strandell stated that he knows that they haven't been able to get any final flood plain zoning LiDAR, for some reason it hasn't gotten approved, and he doesn't know where the hang-up is.

Vein asked if LiDAR is primarily for contour mapping. DeMers responded that it is for elevation. Vein stated that this already has LiDAR contour mapping. Strandell said that he doesn't know what kind of overlap there is. Vein explained that he was a part of the International Water Institute, who did the whole Red River Basin, south of the border, so LiDAR

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

already exists for this area, he just doesn't know what level of accuracy they did, but that has been in place for years. Haugen commented that that was part of the Technical Advisory Committee's discussion; the fact that LiDAR exists already for most of the area. He said that they were told that Minnesota, just on the Minnesota side of course, a more recent LiDAR inventory in place; and he doesn't know how that addresses your flood plain map. Strandell said that this is just a subject that hasn't been on their table lately, or where it stands, other than that they haven't been able to get final word on flood plain elevations.

Haugen stated that of the jurisdictions that are part of the MPO, the East Grand Forks Water and Light were the ones that were expressing some interest on LiDAR, and after the Technical Advisory Committee meeting they now know where they can get some of their LiDAR resources instead of through this process, no one else was really expressing interest in LiDAR.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen stated that included in the packet is an update on where we are at in the process. He commented that most of the staff report is written for other people as it is commenting on the action you took at your last meeting, so some of it is just rehashing what this body took action on, but we did eliminate 17th Avenue South, so we did negotiate our revised scope-of-work, and got both A.T.A.C. and Kimley-Horn to that \$22,000.00 threshold.

Haugen stated that A.T.A.C. will be getting the travel demand model results and will give those results to Kimley-Horn, and then they will produce the traffic analysis, similar to the one we saw when we were discussing it.

Haugen commented that he expects to have this information available at our next Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board meetings.

Haugen stated that as part of this we should also have our 2030 and 2045 Traffic Analysis of where we are expecting growth in traffic and what issues it may cause us, so it won't just be river crossings for discussion.

Haugen said that, as you will recall, at the end of our meeting last month Mr. Malm reported on some discussion that the County Board had taken the previous day, particularly on the Grand Forks Merrifield Road area. He explained that, as noted in the draft minutes, which we just approved; there is a need for some clarification as to Mr. Malm's statement that the county is talking about setting aside 3 mills over an 8 year period to fund their side of a bridge at Merrifield. He said that when he talked to Mr. West about this, he indicated that it was really

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

just discussion, and that he isn't aware of any direction given to him that he was to pursue these things, but instead he felt that he was just planting a seed as to what could be done and to just start a conversation about it, so it isn't as definitive as the minutes state, it is still being discussed, correct. Malm responded that that is correct.

Malm explained that at their County meeting yesterday someone questioned this, and he said that all Mr. West is doing is going out and finding out what the people want, and this is just one proposal, one suggestion and the committee said that they would think about doing it. He added that when he made the comment "taking the lead" it doesn't mean going ahead with anything specific, it means investigating with the other groups like Polk County, the States, etc.

Haugen commented that he did provide Mr. West with a copy of the Merrifield Bridge Feasibility Study Report that we have, so he has a fairly good understanding of the feasibility of a structure at that location.

Haugen reported that they have draft Goals and Objectives for review and comment. He said that they have had a lot of discussion about autonomous vehicles and some discussion on connected vehicles. He commented that, because of that, they weren't really covering those topics well in the Goals/Objectives/Standards so they are proposing adding the following language to Goal #6:

Objective #5: Consider advances in autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles technology in the transportation planning and programming processes.

Standards:

Participate in state and national autonomous vehicle and connected vehicle planning efforts.

Support implementation in autonomous vehicle and connected vehicle technology that collectively provide the increased transportation options for people and freight.

Recognize and address autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles changes at the local, regional, state and national level that influence the metro area's transportation system.

Haugen explained that the reason for adding this to Goal #6 is because Goal #6 already has discussion regarding our ITS Regional Architecture. He said that in 2019 the work program shows that we will be proposing updating our ITS Regional Architecture. He explained that the primary reason for this is because now the architecture is addressing connected vehicles and autonomous vehicles and we need to have it in place, so that is Objective #4; Objective #5 is the one that specifically talks about autonomous and connected vehicle technology. He pointed out that they are basically saying that we will keep as up-to-date with this as we can.

Haugen commented that they asked the Technical Advisory Committee for their comments, and he hopes to get them by Friday.

Haugen reported that next month we have been asked to make a decision on what we are doing for Safety Performance Targets, and we have had a lot of discussion about setting the target. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

added that the other half of that is the programming and what it means if we are setting targets, how that might or might not impact the programming.

Haugen stated that they were not able to schedule; that originally at the Technical Advisory Committee we talked about having both States come and provide us some dialogue on the safety target and programming side of it, but our Technical Advisory Committee schedule didn't coincide with other people's schedules so we are still trying to figure it all out. He added that tomorrow the MPOs are meeting with MnDOT to talk about safety target setting and programming so we will try to get it nailed down a bit more. He said that there are no set meetings at this time with the NDDOT, so we are trying to understand that programming side of this, but he thinks we have a good understanding of what each States targets are, so if we decide to do targets at the local level, what those could be so we are just trying to get that last piece of information as to whether or not impact programming, and if it does is it negative or positive.

Haugen commented that you will be asked at next month's meeting if you want to establish your own local targets or if you just want to use the States targets on the safety side.

Haugen reported that just to expand on not just safety targets, but they are working with both State DOTs on obtaining the data for the other target levels as well. He explained that PM2 (performance measure 2) are bridge and pavement conditions; and PM3 (performance measure 3) are travel time reliabilities for vehicles, and specifically for freight vehicles. He said that they are still working on these data sets, and are moving forward, but they are still struggling a bit to get an understanding of how the safety program side is changing, or may change due to not having the safety targets in place.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Grasser stated that he is wondering if, the bridge element that we are now doing, does that warrant a sub-topic within the 2045 Street/Highway Plan work activity; should it be a sub-target as far as its completion date and work activities. He said that he is still trying to make sure that he has in his head all the pieces that go into the Long Range Transportation Plan, and all those different components that have to come together at the end.

Grasser said that one other comment he has is that maybe some of the things that are shown on this update, such as the GIS, Corridor Preservation, and other on-going activities that we don't have anything targeted, is it really useful, or can they be dropped off.

Vein said that right now Mr. Grasser has two different questions, one on the bridge part of the 2045 Street and Highway Plan, is that correct. Grasser responded that that would be one of them that came to his mind when we were talking about it because it is talking about that special element.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

Vein asked if the completion dates are separate between the bridge portion of the project and the total Street and Highway Plan project. Haugen responded that conceivably yes, if you wanted to make a decision that you are either not going to try to fund any bridges by 2045 but you have the analysis, then that could be done early in the process and then by the time we get to the final 2045 plan we no longer are trying to identify or wrestle with the bridge issue, so in that sense, yes; but if you want to go the opposite direction we would probably wrestle with that until the end of the 2045 Street and Highway Element.

Vein said that he knows that this has come out as a specific issue, the bridges, and what are we going to do with it probably has more interest than maybe the overall plan does. Grasser stated that from his perspective he thinks we need to have something a little more targeted and focused there because right now it is just the traffic analysis part, right, so he doesn't want us to lose track of this thing eighteen months from now and he thinks the issue is going to float back up among the City Councils, so he doesn't think we will be able to have our best foot forward if we continue to not have any answers, so he would like to see it shown as a sub-target.

Vein commented that if we wait until the very end and go in a different direction we may have to revise the plan depending on where those bridges would be, so it would seem to be an important sub-set to know earlier before you finish the final plan. Haugen responded that staffs intent is, after the February meeting, assuming that we have the results from this added scope, and after the board has had a chance to review them and get comfortable with them, we would have another joint meeting to present that data to everyone, and the hope would be that we can further narrow down locations so that way if we need to go to the next step of further analysis, he hopes that we aren't still studying all four locations.

Vein asked if the joint meeting would be like the one we had earlier with the various entities. Haugen responded it would be like that. Vein said, though, that any motion made at that meeting would still come from the MPO. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that we would try to make sure that we capture both County Commissions because of this recent action that the Grand Forks County is leading for this specific site, so we would try to make sure that both county commissions are aware of, and invited to this meeting.

Grasser said, then, that it might be that the data portion of this contract would be available in the next 30 to 60 days, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct. Grasser stated that, again, whatever the dates are he thinks it would be good to have them because then we all have the same frame of mind as to what the timeframe is. Vein added that he thinks it would be nice to get that resolved sooner rather than later anyway.

Consensus was to add the bridge portion of the study as a sub-target and to remove the on-going activities.

b. Bill Listing For 12/16/17 to 1/12/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the December 16, 2017 to January 12, 2018 period was included in the packet.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, January 17th, 2018**

c. Federal Government Shut-Down

Haugen reported that you are probably hearing things about a possible federal government shut-down this Friday. He stated that it is sounding rather “iffy” on whether or not they will accomplish a resolution, but from the MPO operations perspective, it won’t impact us, per-say, but there is potential impact to other federal highway and federal transit programs depending on how long the shut-down is.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 17TH,
2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:35 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager