

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SPECIAL JOINT FUTURE BRIDGE LOCATINOS MEETING
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018 – 5:30 P.M.
Grand Forks County Office Building – 6th Floor Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the February 22nd, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 5:39 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent were: Al Grasser, Marc DeMers, and Mike Powers.

Guests Present were: (See Sign-In Sheet In File)

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

INTRODUCTIONS

Vein asked that everyone present please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS OF TRAFFIC ANALYSIS OF
POTENTIAL FUTURE BRIDGE CROSSINGS OF THE RED RIVER**

Haugen reported that last December we had another joint meeting to talk about if we should look at additional river crossing locations, and if we do how many should we look at. He stated that the results were that we would look at four locations and, per the MPO Board's request, we would do a traffic impact analysis of those four locations, and Mr. Bourdon, who is our project manager with Kimley-Horn, is here to present those findings, which were distributed electronically to everyone prior to this meeting. He commented that this is being done at the same time that the MPO is updating its Street and Highway Element of its Long Range Transportation Plan, so we do have a lot of other transportation and street issues that we are looking at, but this meeting is just focusing on these potential future river crossing sites and what the traffic volume changes are forecasted to be if one is placed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Haugen stated that with this, at the end of the meeting, our hope is that if we are going to move forward, we would do so with fewer than four additional bridge crossings if possible because the next steps would entail more costly analyses of each individual site, so this first step was not as costly as the next step would be if we are actually going to pursue these four sites.

Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn, stated that he will give a really brief overview of where they are at in the overall planning process; obviously the focus is to talk a little about this traffic related river crossing analysis, and we will talk a little about the next steps at the end as well.

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

Bourdon commented that they started working on updating the Street/Highway Element of the Long Range Transportation Plan back in the summer of 2017. He stated that they have done a good job of working through existing conditions and are now moving through and are part way through the process of establishing some goals and performance measures; and that process will continue.

Bourdon said that, based on your existing conditions and input from the public, and looking at some of data we are beginning to work through the process of identifying issues and looking at what particular transportation improvements should be investigated further.

Bourdon commented that the next Public Meeting will be held in April; and they are going to present more of the performance measures to the public, and talk more about some of these issues where ultimately we need to have a pretty good draft wrapped up in the summer so that we can get the draft out to the public of what is going to be in this plan, and then there is certainly a process of getting input from a variety of entities prior to final adoption which will occur more toward the end of the year.

Bourdon stated that he will talk a little bit about what we were focused on, and as Mr. Haugen mentioned, we focused on really looking at what would happen, in terms of more of a traffic volume and traffic operation standpoint on a planning level if we looked at various river crossing locations. He said that they then looked at four locations, and they really wanted to look at how things would be impacted from the local traffic and connectivity standpoint. He stated that they did end up basing their analysis using the Travel Demand Model, and A.T.A.C. has been doing runs, so that is a tool where they can look at each of the crossings, put them into the model, and then we can see where the traffic is anticipated to move throughout the roadway network.

Bourdon said that, again, areas of review they were looking at what happened at the existing crossings, was traffic moving to some of the other four, so they looked individually at the following locations: 24th Avenue So., 32nd Avenue So., 47th Avenue So., and Merrifield Road. He explained that they would put in a bridge crossing, run the model, and see what happened; then they would pull that one and add another one so they could get one variable to see how traffic shifted and the impacts.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Bourdon commented that they were looking at some of what happened more from a neighborhood perspective, but also as more of a regional and local roadway perspective to kind of get a comparison of the various metrics, based on each of the crossings.

Bourdon stated that these are just kind of, what did we assume, as part of this modeling we looked at, and they basically assumed that any of the new river crossings would be a two-lane bridge, so they didn't do anything and assume that it was going to be a four-lane bridge; they assumed that we are going to be connecting it at each end with two-lane roads, and they did add a bunch of additional through-lane capacity at either end, and they did not make any new connections at I-29 or at U.S. 2 to the east, so they didn't add any connections, so that is just some of the ground rules of what the modeling assumptions were, but they were all the same for each of the scenarios.

Vein commented, like 47th Avenue would have been the potential for a ramp. Bourdon responded that, yes, that would have been one of them where ultimately there could be an interchange. Vein stated that one of the issues they have had, at least on the 32nd Avenue Corridor, is that we know that there is congestion there, right, and that the future is, to relieve that congestion, is to build an off-ramp on 47th Avenue. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding though that is probably some long-term future project.

Haugen stated that all three of the interchanges in town have congestion issues today, and in the future they won't get better, they will get worse. Vein agreed, adding, though that he doesn't know how best to handle that because, we are talking about that, and obviously we don't know, but there would be impacts with 47th because that probably is an interchange that they would be pursuing. Haugen said, though, that there are two things going on, and that is why they didn't model any new interchanges or any new connections to U.S. #2 on the eastside; and that is because the focus we were told to look at is on local traffic, and so as we make those connections and we are starting to include regional traffic, if you will, into the analysis, and we were told the focus was going to be on local traffic.

Haugen said that another reason is that the I-29 Study showed, and even this model run shows, that the bridge is connected to the Interstate Interchanges, and the model isn't showing a strong correlation between those, the model is really showing that these bridges are really only impacting Washington Street and Bygland Road, and once you get beyond those there is less of an impact, and when you get to the Interchange it is hard to decipher whether it is causing more traffic at the I-29 area or less, it is pretty neutral at that point.

Haugen stated that, for those two reasons, with the major reason being that we were told that this was going to be a bridge for local traffic. Vein said that he would agree with that, but the implications are beyond that no matter if it is a bridge for local traffic or not, it is going to impact those others. He added that the Merrifield Road is another one where you didn't include ramps, but again that would be a foreseeable thing to have happen too, so those are two things that he questions. Haugen commented that we would introduce those if we narrowed down the bridge locations to what seems to be the ones that are really being pursued, and analyze further, then as part of a group of projects we would include those interchanges and see how they affect the whole network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Bourdon reported that some of this, based on the local nature, is you get so many different variables doing just kind of high level streaming; and some of the thought is, let's get some input based on only looking at these scenarios, and if the input is received, if you have a few less variable in there, you get a more in-depth analysis, so as Mr. Haugen said, we certainly can dive into some more stuff moving forward. Vein commented that you've got what you've got, so he is just bringing this forward as issues.

Bourdon referred to the presentation, and explained that the next few slides basically show some of the key intersections they looked at in the region, and the overall intersection level of service, which has a rating of A-F. He pointed out that it goes from top to bottom so when you look at the top one it shows the existing level of service, and then the next is the no-build level of service, and then we go from crossings from the north all the way to the south, with the Merrifield Road scenario at the bottom.

Bourdon stated that a couple of key take-a-ways, when we kind of look and compare the intersection operations at a global level, is that over at Belmont and 4th there is certainly deterioration where we go from a Level Of Service F under no action, then we improve at any of the river crossings of 24th, 32nd and 47th to a Level Of Service C, and then there is the river crossing at Merrifield where it deteriorates back to a Level Of Service F.

Bourdon reported that at Washington and 32nd we start with a Level Of Service D today, under the no action, we would anticipate traffic will go up so that deteriorates to a Level Of Service E; and for the rest there is Level Of Service F, with the 24th and 32nd crossing, but there is some improvement as you do the 47th and the Merrifield Road crossings with Level Of Service E, so we don't go from a Level Of Service F to a Level Of Service A at that location, but there are some subtle differences.

Bourdon commented, that as we look at more of a Link Level Of Service; and we are going to look at some diagrams, there are a few take-a-ways that he will try to identify as we go through the graphics, but one thing they did notice was that the Point Bridge operates generally better under the 24th and 32nd Avenue South crossings, so a little less traffic is drawn from the north as you move further south with the crossings, so there is a little less improvement of operation on the Point Bridge.

Bourdon stated that there is some improvement on Gateway Drive under all the crossings scenarios except when just looking at the Merrifield Road crossing by it-self because it is, again, too far south.

Bourdon said that in regard to Washington Street, he isn't saying that, necessarily, things have great operating conditions, Level of Service A and B, but there are some improvements when we look at the 32nd or 47th Avenue crossings. He added that you will see under the other scenarios that there is a little more poor level of service, and then Belmont Road operates generally better under all crossing scenarios.

Bourdon commented that the next scenario shows on the left, what the Link Level Of Service are under the existing base model, and on the right it shows what the no build Link Level Of Service is; so this is basically saying that "based on existing conditions, compared to future no-build

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

network with traffic growth and some impacts of that growth, there is generally going to be some deterioration, particularly on the roadways that already have capacity issues”.

Bourdon stated that a couple of other things to note is that as you look at the Gateway Drive or U.S. #2 crossing, that is operating at a Level Of Service E under no action conditions; and if you start looking at the Point Bridge crossing that is more at a Level Of Service E as well, so you are going to have some poor operation on those two links. He added that there is a Level Of Service C on Belmont to the south and a Level Of Service B to the north, so as we go through this he will try to identify some of those points that changed from before.

Bourdon referred to the presentation, and reported that he will now go through each river crossing separately. He pointed out that on the right there is going to be a map that shows the daily volumes, and they kind of compare the existing average daily traffic at the top with the 2045 no build, and then the forecast traffic for that scenario so you can kind of compare what would it be under no build versus what would happen at this particular river crossing scenario.

Bourdon went over the different scenarios briefly.

Vein commented that it appears that 24th and 32nd are very similar. Bourdon responded that when we look at some of these crossings, as we start looking at volumes and adding them up, there are some pretty subtle differences, but there are some night and day differences as well as some similarities.

Bourdon said that, just to kind of generalize this, the Level Of Service is improved at the Point Bridge with the 24th, 32nd, and 47th Avenue crossing alternatives. He added that Washington Street tends to operate better under the 32nd and 47th Avenue crossing alternatives. He stated that Belmont looks better under all of the scenarios.

Bourdon reported that the ADTs on Bygland Road, north of Rhinehart, decreased more if the 24th or 32nd crossings were selected. He pointed out that you can also see that there is a little bit more traffic, and less of a decrease, with the 47th and Merrifield crossings. He added that in looking at the Trunk Highway 220 river crossing, basically the ADTs will be highest if you look at the 32nd or the 47th Avenue crossings are selected.

Haugen summarized that what this is telling him is, again, getting back at, is the focus local; so which of the bridges are taking the most local traffic away, and that would be shown by that one point on Bygland Road, north of Rhinehart; and the other point is the Mallory Bridge, how it changes with each river crossing, it always attracts more traffic, so as you go further south that kind of ratio of the traffic over the new bridge, how much of that is regional traffic versus local traffic, and that is what the one table is trying to get at. He pointed out that at the very bottom the Mallory River Crossing, or Trunk Highway 220, the ratio of that versus the traffic change at Bygland Road, it starts to flip as soon as you get past 24th.

Bourdon commented that the first table really just summarizes the Link Level Of Service at the actual crossing locations, and so, similar to what was said before, but in one location where it is easy to see, we have the no-build for Gateway and U.S. 2 at E; and then there is improvement with the 24th, 32nd, and 47th Avenue crossings and deterioration with the Merrifield crossing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Bourdon stated that there is an improvement that is always going to operate under all these scenarios at a Level of Service F; and then the Point Bridge generally improves the most under the 24th and 32nd Avenue crossings, improving from an E to a B, and there is also improvement at 47th and less with the Merrifield Crossing at a Level Of Service D.

Bourdon reported that what they did next was to look a bit at where there are some increases based on the type of traffic, so they lowered the vehicle miles traveled on the lower functional classes; which are defined more as you minor arterials, collectors, and local streets, and then asked how they impacted the traffic on the higher functional classes; which are your principal arterials, your freeway ramps and your freeways. He referred to a table and pointed out that some of these scenarios pop out a little bit.

Bourdon commented that with the 24th Avenue crossing, there is going to be some slight increases to the lower functional class, so there is about a 199 extra vehicle miles traveled under that; but you see that there will be the greatest reduction in the higher functional class VMTs.

Bourdon pointed out that if you look at 24th, and the reduction, you will see the total reduction of miles on the freeway, ramps, and major arterials; so here, when we say it's the most, it is a general reduction of about 24,000 vehicle miles traveled. He added, though, that you will see that there is a slight increase in the local miles traveled of roughly 199 miles, so if you look at the table, the higher functional class roadway has the greatest reduction, and there is a slight increase of roughly 199 miles with that scenario, just looking at this network wide.

Bourdon stated that, working backward, the 24th Avenue crossing reduces vehicle hours traveled the most of any alternative; so that is basically how long are you going to sit in the car, and that is one of these fun metrics that the travel demand model throws out. He said that, the 24th Avenue crossing, looking at the bottom and the total reduction of vehicle hours traveled, it basically is a reduction of a little over 1,000 vehicle hours traveled, and the other scenarios vary from a reduction of 800 to an increase of 174 for the 47th Avenue crossing. Haugen commented that these numbers are the numbers that you would use, typically in the rudimentary benefit/cost analysis, so the more negative numbers of reduction the more benefit you are getting from that structure. Bourdon added that that is where you can assign a variety of user costs for workers and people going to and from work, and kind of put some of those other factors in there as to how it impacts the traveling public as a whole.

Bourdon said that the 32nd Avenue crossing is anticipated as having the second greatest reduction in vehicle miles traveled, so as previously discussed, it shows a reduction that is relatively similar to 24th Avenue, and as mentioned before the 24th and 32nd Avenue crossings are pretty similar, within about a reduction of 300 miles. He added that 32nd Avenue also has the greatest lower functional class reduction, so on the lower functional class reduction the reduction is 1,300 vehicles, so that is almost the second greatest reduction where the Merrifield would reduce things by 4,200 vehicles miles traveled.

Bourdon commented that the 47th Avenue crossing will end up having the lowest vehicle mile reduction of 13,491; so on the high end we were talking roughly 23,000, over here it is around 13,000, so that is kind of similar to 47th and Merrifield Road crossings, they are relatively

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

similar. He added that it does have the largest lower functional class vehicle mile traveled increase, so if you kind of look at what happens on the minor streets on the bottom of the table, you will see that we go from where we have some reduction in vehicle miles traveled on the local, this would be more of an increase of 700 miles, so it is the highest increase.

Bourdon stated that 47th Avenue is the only scenario that would increase the vehicle miles traveled; the others on the bottom table all see some reduction, varying between a reduction of 1,000 to roughly 675, this would be an increase of about 174 vehicle hours traveled.

Bourdon commented that, in talking a little about the Merrifield Road crossing scenario; the lower functional vehicle miles traveled, under that scenario, would be reduced the most, so that is a reduction of roughly 4,200 vehicle miles traveled, so you can see it is reducing some of the travel on the local roadway network. He added that on a regional level it reduces that travel on major arterials the least, so it is a reduction of roughly 13,500 compared to some of the others we talked about that are quite a bit more.

Vetter referred to Merrifield Road crossing, and asked if on Merrifield Road, with the increase of just over 4,000, does that mean that regional traffic isn't coming through town, it is bypassing the City altogether. Haugen responded that it is implying that. He added that when we use the label "local" you have to remember that most of the county highways are considered local in the model, so it is really addressing that rural/county commute into and of the town, but it is local in the fact that it is lower functional class, they are all local major collectors.

Haugen referred to the table and pointed out that you will see the Mallory Bridge volumes that are changed by Merrifield, versus all the rest of them, it is low; but then when you look at the local traffic volumes it is three times regional than local traffic crossing Merrifield.

Bourdon reported that the next slide is next steps. He stated that the focus has been stated, as they said before, to focus more on kind of the "local" traffic aspects; and they are now wondering of some of the locations be dropped, based on input, from further analysis, like Mr. Haugen said, just because the analysis gets a little more arduous, so if there are some that don't make sense, maybe we don't have to analyze them for the sake of analyzing them.

Bourdon stated that if some locations remain, then the next steps would be for us to go through and exercise and do some timing levels and getting cost estimate, because that would tie into the planning process, as to how the crossings compare, and there certainly would be more focus on what do things near the crossing look like from some key intersection geometry, similar to the south at Merrifield, we have gotten quite a bit of work done so we don't necessarily have to invent the wheel, but at some of the other locations before we can move forward there is probably some review needed just to see how things would touch down and how some of the intersections may be impacted.

Haugen commented that we are just trying to make sure that we are looking at, really, river crossings in more detail that are serving the purpose you are asking us to look into, and so far you have been saying focus on the local traffic, and it seems like the further south you go the less local traffic it is serving, so should we continue to look at them to try to be the bridge that serves local traffic.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Haugen stated that when we talk about the whole benefit/cost thing, we do have one location that has a positive number for the local lower functional class; but it also has a positive number for the vehicle hours traveled, that is 47th Avenue South. He added that, with a glance at what benefit/cost would be it would be tough to show that that has a ratio of one or better, even though the miles traveled overall is 15,000, the hours traveled is a positive so the benefit /cost is going to be tough, and it is almost half of what 32nd and 24th are for miles traveled.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Malm stated that we have done this for years, we've talked, and somebody has got to make a decision where you want to do it, because then you have to cure all the rest of the problems when you make that decision; and there are lots of problems that we aren't talking about here.

Malm said that he was here when Mrs. Strand said that she would not let her children walk across the street, well those children have grandchildren now, that is how long we've been at this; what's the future, we are a planning organization, how do we plan to the future, what's in the plans for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks dealing with growth, those are the kinds of things we never get through until we pick up a location, and then we get all the rumbles that come with it.

Vein responded that there is a technical solution and then there is a political solution. Malm said, though, that the technical solution is to choose the location, and then you people on the City Councils that have to deal with the political ramifications. Vein agreed, adding that he thinks the idea was to have the right amount of data available when you make a decision to be able to understand that decision. Malm commented that you can put all the data in the world in until you affect people, and people know how they are going to get affected. He added that all he is saying is that he doesn't know how we are going to make any decisions here, who is going to make that decision.

Malm reported that the Grand Forks County Engineer said that he would lead anything that deals with Merrifield Road, to try to put it all together, so he would say then that we should let that one stay in there because that would be county monies, not city monies.

Malm commented that he doesn't want to see us go through anybody's neighborhood. He said that 47th goes by schools, again, and every mother runs out into the street and screams.

Vein asked, before we added additional bridge locations, what was the original intent going to be for a bridge location in this study. Haugen responded that this was carrying forward the current locations. Vein asked what they are. Haugen responded that they are 32nd Ave and Merrifield. Vein said, then, that 32nd Avenue and Merrifield were going to be the original locations had we not had the recommendation to add originally three more locations, then it was down to the two locations of 24th and 47th Avenue South. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that 32nd and Merrifield have been the two future river sites since roughly 2001, and we update this plan every five years, and they have been adopted three times, and since we haven't been informed otherwise, we assumed that we would just be carrying them again.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Vetter asked if, based on the data, can we agree that 47th Avenue should probably be dropped for the remainder of this study. Vein responded that he wishes there were more city council members present because he is a little concerned about making that decision since the President of the Grand Forks City Council was the one that originally proposed we add more bridges to the study.

Vein commented that the intent, if he is correct, was to try to reduce this so we can save study costs, otherwise there is no problem with continuing to study all four locations. Haugen responded that there isn't, so if you tell us to study them we will do so. Vein asked if that wasn't the original intent, to study all four of them, and you asked us to scale back. Haugen responded that he thinks the original intent was to try to start with as few as possible, and as the deliberation in December ensued, it was decided that we would only look at 32nd and north, and then in the end 47th and Merrifield came in when the larger group met, and then when the MPO Executive Policy Board met to finalize the scope of work there was originally talk of just looking at 32nd Ave and Merrifield, and then the Board dropped 17th and left 24th and 47th to be included with 32nd and Merrifield. Haugen said that we said we would go as far as looking at them from this traffic point of view to see if any of the four crossings didn't perform as well as the others, for that local traffic. He added that he thinks that that is kind of suggesting that for local traffic the two southern crossings just aren't really performing well for the cost that remains for siting them for local traffic, so from a staff point of view, why would we try to push those even further when the data is already suggesting that they aren't good candidates for local traffic.

Sanders stated that Merrifield would be more of a regional functioning bridge. He added that they have always stated that we want to have hazardous and wide-loads and such by-pass Downtown Grand Forks, so we would try to get Merrifield built with an interchange on Interstate 29, and that would function as a Trunk Highway 2 By-Pass, basically; so we know what its function is, and then you start looking at 47th, 32nd, and 24th Avenues as just more of a local function between East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, it isn't going to be a by-pass bridge. Haugen agreed, adding that it has been stated it would perform like the Point Bridge performs. Sanders said, then, that you just have to pick the best location for that type of function.

Strandell commented that, from a realistic standpoint, if you want to project when a new bridge would be in place you would probably be looking at ten years, between the fund raising effort that is going to have to occur, design and construction, it will be probably ten years out before you have something in place. Vein said that it is longer than that that we are planning for. Haugen responded that he thinks what Mr. Strandell is saying is that if we decided today to get started on planning for a bridge, as quickly as we can get it, it would be at least a ten year process.

Strandell stated that another thing we haven't talked about, and probably won't at this group, is funding. He said that he has heard the cost for a two lane bridge would be about \$25 million and \$50 million if you want a high and dry bridge; where are we going to find that much money, he doesn't think it will be very easy at all, so that ten years is a probably a minimum, so we should be thinking, then, as to what kind of development is going to happen; residential, commercial, whatever, in this area and how all of that will fit into the picture.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Vein asked, when you looked at this you looked at future traffic volumes, what year did you look at. Haugen responded that 2045 is our future year estimate. Vein said, then, that you are using 2045 as the design and projected traffic to justify your numbers that are in here, and you assumed a certain amount of growth during that time. Haugen responded that they did; he added that they worked with both cities, primarily to update their land use plans and to identify, not just what type of growth, but also to get an indication of how many employees would be in an area, how many homes would be in an area, so that when we say 2045 volumes we utilized the greatest and latest land use assumptions both cities are giving us.

Bourdon reported that all of the information we receive from both cities is fed into the model to then generate what the volumes are so you get the best forecast, which could vary on the outskirts versus downtown versus a really growth area, so individual growth rates will vary, but this is all based on our best forecast assumptions in 2045, and those were the numbers that were all compared side-by-side.

Vein commented that, as he recalls, in line with what you just said, the original intent was some of the concerns we had with traffic volumes on the Grand Forks side, on Belmont and Reeves, those two were the most specific, and the idea was, as he recalls, hearing what can we do to alleviate some of that internal congestion, is that right. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated that the Sorlie Bridge, and as your seeing in the results, we are not really changing the volumes on the Sorlie Bridge; on the Kennedy Bridge we need to do something because if we don't do something the Kennedy Bridge will start having capacity issues in the future.

Vein said, but again as he looks at this, he is trying to remember, none of those were tremendously beneficial for the Point Bridge, there was some benefit, but it wasn't like it was night and day improvements, that he recalls, is there. Bourdon referred to Page 15 of the presentation and pointed out that it shows the level of service for the scenarios with the 2045 No-Build on the left and then it goes 24th, 32nd, 47th, and Merrifield, so north to south; so on Minnesota Avenue/1st Street, the Point Bridge it is at a Level Of Service E. Vein asked what a Level Of Service E is. Bourdon responded that a Level of Service E is pretty close is not desirable, but it is better than a Level Of Service F. He pointed out that with a crossing at 24th or 32nd we get it to a Level Of Service B, so there is quite a bit of improvement because traffic is getting pulled off of that crossing because there is an alternative route available. He added that you do still get to a Level Of Service C with a 47th Ave crossing, which isn't as good, but then you go back to a Level of Service D with a Merrifield crossing.

Vein commented that the one thing that maybe does bother him a little about removing 47th Ave without looking at the impacts of the interchange at 47th. He said that he knows we are talking about local traffic, but you would have some impact on traffic if you have the interchange at 47th Ave and I-29. Haugen responded that the I-29 Study showed that the interchange impact was less than a 1,000 cars a day, with these river crossings, when we analyzed it as part of the I-29 Study. Vein asked if they included a river crossing at 47th in the I-29 Study. Haugen responded that they did not at 47th. Vein said that that is the one that he is wondering what the impact would be.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Falck pointed out that 47th is developed, but it is less developed than 24th and 32nd by a substantial margin, as far as cost and impact on neighborhoods. Malm said, though, that that is where the City is going to grow on the Grand Forks side, so we should kick all of them out and build a north by-pass, go all the way around, start at the airport and go all the way around the north end then we wouldn't have any problems. Vein stated that that was a consideration in the past. Malm agreed, adding that we didn't even talk about it.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING ALL FOUR LOCATIONS ON TO OUR RESPECTIVE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR THEIR REVIEW AND DECISION.

Mock asked, we are talking about studying these further, would it be possible to get cost estimates for what it will cost to study one, two, verses all locations, to provide to those entities. Haugen responded that yes, they can do that. Vetter stated that, on the same token, this is going to be a small cost compared to the cost of whatever we do in the politics of what it is going to be. Mock said that she thinks that we need to know what we are voting on, what is the difference in cost if we cut 47th versus leaving it in when this isn't going to happen for twenty years.

Malm commented that we tried to cut some of them off before and they all came back in again, so he thinks we have done our job and now we will send it back to them and they can do their job.

Vein stated that, even though this is an official MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, he would welcome any comments that any of the other elected officials have if they want to comment on the motion that has been made.

Diedrich asked if the cost would change much from one location to another. Haugen responded that it depends on the real scope of work. He explained that doing cost estimates is not that great, it is more about touch-points; and what he means by touch-points is if we go high and dry, which means we are above the flood protection system versus can we penetrate the flood protection system, so making that analysis, since each site is different because of the lay of the land, and to come up with how they would touch down would mean that planning level engineering work would still need to be done; but that is where the variables in cost get with the more sites you have. Vein commented that, on the same token, you are not going to get that specific, you are probably going to have a range of \$25 to \$30 million or something like that, you're not going to be able to pin it down too much at this high level. Haugen responded that you have to remember on the Minnesota side, once you get south of 32nd Avenue, you no longer have a flood protection system, so do assume that we build everything up to the flood protected level, so there are those added issues to the study, that we would expect you to want to have answers to when we come up with these costs.

Strandell stated that he is going to have a problem with trying to build a high and dry bridge. He said that when we have a flood it is probably a two week event, why are we going to double the cost for two weeks; for two weeks we can get along without it. Vein said that he understands this on the affordability side, but that is going to be a different question than what we have before us now, which would be just locations with this motion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Thursday, February 22nd, 2018**

Malm commented that that is what we need the political people to decide, how much money, how are they going to raise the money to do it, because he doesn't want to stick them with a huge thing, they need to make this decision, we aren't here to do that, we are a planning board and we took it to two, and then brought it back to four, and that is the plan and they can do what they want with it because that is what they'll do, they'll bring it back and they will decide at their local level. He added that he thinks we are just wasting his time, maybe the rest of you got a lot out of this, but he has heard this for twenty years, we had, in Grand Forks, the interchange at Merrifield already paid for, but everybody started screaming that it is too far south of town, so they pulled it out. He said that the property was given to them, they could have used it as their match to pay for it, so let them decide, that is what he elected you to do, Mr. Vein.

Voting Aye: Strandell, Malm, Strandell, and Mock.

Voting Nay: Vetter.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Grasser, and DeMers.

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 22ND, 2018,
SPECIAL JOINT FUTURE BRIDGE LOCATION MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE
POLICY BOARD AT 6:39 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager