

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

**Wednesday, March 21st, 2018 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the March 21st, 2018, 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: Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, Ken Vein, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, Mike Powers, and Al Grasser.

Guest(s): David Kuharneko, 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 FEBRUARY 21ST, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FEBRUARY 21ST, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AERIAL IMAGERY CONTRACT

Kouba stated that back in January the Executive Policy Board approved the RFP for the Aerial Photos, and the deadline for submitting proposals was set for February 19th. She reported that they received four proposals and the Selection Committee met and interviewed all four firms, and ultimately chose Quantum Spatial to do the photography.

Kouba commented that Quantum Spatial actually came in under budget. She pointed out that the scope of work and cost proposal was included in the packets, and stated that staff is recommending the Executive Policy Board execute a contract with them to do the Aerial Photos.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE ALLOWING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH QUANTUM SPATIAL TO DO THE AERIAL IMAGERY PHOTO, AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$42,000.00.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser.

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

Kouba reported that this is a request from the City of East Grand Forks to amend our FY2018 Minnesota Side T.I.P. to purchase a 300 Class Bus for the Dial-A-Ride Program. She explained that originally we programmed to purchase five Dial-A-Ride vans, but since Grand Forks has received funding from the State of North Dakota to purchase vans already, and there is a need for a larger vehicle for the Dial-A-Ride program, East Grand Forks decided to purchase the bus instead, and will be using their 5307 funds.

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

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO FY2018-2021 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P.

Viafara reported that the NDDOT is requesting an amendment to the FY2018-2021 North Dakota Side T.I.P. to do an emergency repair to two segments of the Washington Street Corridor in FY2018. He said that the project will entail a mill and overlay of two segments; from DeMers to Hammerling and from 1st Avenue North to 8th Avenue North, and will occur this construction season.

Viafara stated that as a result to this amendment there are also some changes required to the origin of cost that require an amendment to the T.I.P.

Viafara said that we are seeking, and asking this body is to approve this request to amend the FY2018 North Dakota Side T.I.P. He added that we did advertise for a public hearing on this item at today's meeting.

Vein opened the public hearing. There was no one present for discussion. Vein closed the public hearing.

MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE FY-2018-2021 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS SUBMITTED.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

Malm asked what kind of job they are going to do this time, they are just going to put black-top on it, and that is just tape on a wound. He added that we'll have redo it pretty soon, won't we. Haugen responded that the project is what the project is, and in the Street/Highway Plan Update we will have at the end of the year we will see when we schedule a complete reconstruction of it, particularly the portion south of DeMers.

Haugen commented that he would like to point out that there are actually two projects being amended into the T.I.P.; the first one is this coming season, and that is the mill and overlay, and the second one is in FY2019 where we will go back and to the ADA curb ramps in that same stretch. Vein said, though, that the overlay will be done in FY2018.

Vein stated that he knows this is the second or third time that we have done an overlay on that section; and as he looks at the streets in Grand Fork; Washington, that section from Hammerling to 8th Avenue North has had an asphalt overlay multiple times, University Avenue is another that we have done an overlay on multiple times. He said that they did make the decision, downtown on DeMers, not to, and then finally to reconstruct, which is the long term solution, but there was a lot of question about cost, and how many times can you continue to do a mill and overlay versus do a permanent one, and his answer to that is that we only have a limited amount of funds, so you have to do the right balance; and while ideally we would like nothing better to do the reconstruction if the funding were available, but it isn't.

DeMers asked if the existing project was to do the North Washington portion and this is just adding the South Washington portion. Haugen responded that there was a request for us to consider, as a candidate project in FY2020, to do a mill and overlay of these two segments of Washington, and that is what we submitted to the NDDOT for consideration, and almost as soon as it was submitted the District Engineer, the City Engineer, and the State Headquarters started to think that FY2020 is too far away, and they looked to find some funding that we could use to move it up to FY2018, so there technically never was a project programmed, it was a candidate project, and now they are programming it in FY2018 with ADA updates in FY2019.

DeMers said that obviously the NDDOT would be managing and designing the project, but you would wonder if there is anything in the design specs that could be changed for the asphalt, that would give it a higher durability and would last longer. He asked if that is something that we have the ability to request or suggest that, or if it is even an option, but if they are doing this as a local mill and overlay spec, it maybe should be a commercial highway spec or something.

Discussion on road conditions ensued.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SCOPE OF WORK FOR A.T.A.C. TRAFFIC COUNTS

Viafara reported that currently the City of Grand Forks enjoys a video detection camera system, but the idea now is to enhance the capabilities of that system to also be able to collect traffic counts. He stated that in order to do this a number of cameras are being located on main corridors such as 42nd Street North and DeMers Avenue.

Viafara commented that staff is requesting the Executive Policy Board approve the Scope-of-Work to allow new cameras be placed at nine intersections along the 42nd Street and DeMers Corridors in order for the consultant to be able to capture more data and provide more information and more decision making opportunities for both the MPO and the Engineering Department.

Viafara pointed out that the Scope-of-Work was included in the packets, and there are no substantial changes besides the fact that these cameras will allow these new reports to be printed. He added that the cost of the overall project is \$55,688.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE SCOPE-OF-WORK FOR A.T.A.C. TO IMPLEMENT THE GRAND FORKS VISION CAMERA DATA COLLECTION AND TRAFFIC ANALYSIS ENHANCEMENTS PROJECT, AS SUBMITTED.

DeMers commented that he thinks it is odd that a State Institution gets to charge 43% overhead for a project that affects State entities. Haugen responded that it is actually less than compared to a local consultant's overhead as they range 160% to 210%, so from that perspective the 43% is reasonable.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser.

MATTER OF FY2018 SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK

Kouba reported that this is something we do every year, we take a look at the spring flooding outlook, and this year, at least so far, is that we will not have a flood event.

Kouba commented that we reported this to the Technical Advisory Committee, and requested that any updates or changes to the contact list be submitted by the end of last week, and received none.

Information only.

MATTER OF FY2018 BIKE MAP

Viafara distributed copies of the FY2018 Bike Map and commented that it is based on previous efforts made by MPO Staff in past years.

Viafara stated that the map has been drafted based on the efforts to implement five of the goals that are supporting the proposed Bike/Pedestrian Element Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

Viafara said that the five goals and objectives are:

- 1) To force economic vitality;
- 2) To improve access and mobility;
- 3) To improve environmental conditions in our way of living in our region;
- 4) To force the integration and connectivity;
- 5) To support tourism with some activities that could bring economic benefits to us.

Viafara referred to the map and pointed out that there are a number of panels that also indicate opportunities for tourism, opportunities for bicyclists to connect to transit, that are being drafted.

Viafara said that it is important to bear in mind that both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks are great towns, and for that reason emphasis also to notice where grade crossings are, particularly to the ones connected to School Safety are there, so overall that is the idea behind this map.

Vein commented that the one comment he would have, and maybe you already have or will talk about this, but obviously it is what we are going to do with DeMers Avenue reconstruction downtown, and the fact that it won't have dedicated bicycle lanes; and will we be looking at creating better bicycle access on 1st Avenue North, or other such access in the downtown as it seems to him that we have talked about the overall study of the downtown, and that bicycle and pedestrian traffic are critical, but are hard to incorporate into that project, but he thinks the intent was that it would be identified for other locations, so how would that happen. Haugen responded that under "Other Business" you will notice that item "C" discusses that the City of Grand Forks has released its RFP for the downtown master plan, and they have also asked the MPO to do a concurrent study on transportation issues in the downtown as well.

Haugen reported that the one realization we all must have with the DeMers Avenue project is that they are not trying to address the deficient capacity issue on DeMers with the reconstruction that is taking place, and so as we look at the future crossing analysis we see that none of those future river crossings really impact DeMers traffic much, so part of what we will be looking at with this downtown study is if we can change the mode share on the river crossings on the Sorlie Bridge, so bike/ped issues in the downtown will be one of the key components, along with transit, to try to shift the mode away from private vehicles.

Haugen stated that the intent is to have the 2018 Bike Map available for distribution at the Home Show at the Alerus Center this weekend, to kick off the biking season, if you will.

Information only.

Grasser reported present.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON BIKE/PED PLAN

Viafara reported that MPO Staff, in coordination with a number of Stakeholders, have been working on the performance measures, advancing the pages related to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

Viafara commented that we had a meeting last December, and some information was provided, and one dealt primarily with performance measures. He said that as a result, they received a number of comments that dealt with the need to address some performance measures to make them more doable, feasible, and more implementable; so those performance measures pointed at security issues, access and mobility, and integration and connectivity, so at this time staff is addressing those comments and is striving to incorporate them into the overall document.

Viafara stated that it is our expectation that once these are incorporated, we can basically move on to finalizing the last chapter of the plan, which is the financials and the City's recommendations, so no later than Monday they will provide these comments to the respective stakeholders, and we are expecting their agreement because we are basically heading their request.

Information only.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Revenue Forecast

Haugen reported that they have been working with both State DOTs, primarily, on how to forecast future revenues. He explained that the State of Minnesota has provided us with what they assume to be the revenue forecast for the Minnesota side of the river. He said that a couple of things to note on that is that in our current Long Range Transportation Plan we are really only relying on every fourth year for the City's Subtarget that the ATP provides; the good news is that it has doubled since our last plan to the current \$850,000 a year forecast, but that is only every fourth year.

Haugen commented that we are trying to work with our Minnesota MPOs and MnDOT; the State of Minnesota is also doing obligation bonds for transportation projects, and currently their opinion is that the MPO shouldn't be relying on any of that funding in their financial forecasting, and we are trying to convince them that as a transportation partner we should be able to reach agreement on the ability to reasonably forecast when we receive some share of those funds, but right now we are at a point where their direction is that we will have to treat them similarly to how we treat the TIGER Grants or other nationally or state competitive grants; we can't put them in our fiscal constraint, but we would probably identify projects that would be great candidates and push those project forth.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side he wishes he had more news, but they are struggling to try to figure out how to do financial forecasting out. He said that North Dakota has historically just been on a biennium financial plan, and with the constraint that the oil prices have made on the State budget, they are back to their mode of only raising State funds to match the federally required 80/20 share.

Haugen reported that there was a transportation funded symposium that he attended last Wednesday. He said that the DOT is planning on to get that information out and fashion some sort of partnership with city/county, consulting associations and anybody else that would join in an effort to try to gear up for the next legislative session to go beyond their typical biennium budget, and to try to have a State revenue system in place where it can be more than just every two years, and being able to count on funding for longer periods. He added that, coupled with that is if the Trump infrastructural proposal is to pass as it is currently formatted, the typical 80/20 match for federal aid project will slip to a 20/80 proposal, so

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

that would mean that our current T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. that go out several years, the federal funds would be substantially cut and those projects would then have to find another revenue source to pick up the match requirement, so there is concern about coming up with some revenue forecasting that the MPOs can rely on, so we are patiently waiting, and are trying to work with the NDDOT, but at some point we are just going to have to go forward either to convince them to cut us slack on our deadline of end of the year transportation plan update adopted, or reach an agreement that this is the best guess that we have at this time, and that we would revisit it as soon as there are newer or more correct information available.

Haugen stated that the third item would be the City sales tax that Grand Forks passed and trying to figure out how that impacts the transportation funding sources that we rely on.

Vein said that on the federal side, that has been a proposal, obviously through the President, but that is just a proposal, so until we have something that Congress supports, because it would have to come through Congress, it doesn't sound very realistic. He stated that he was in Washington a week ago with the Grand Forks Delegation, and the big issue at the League of Cities they were a part of was infrastructure, throughout, and the need for funding for infrastructure, and there wasn't anybody there that wanted an 20/80 split, that is just not feasible, and it just isn't being supported even though that is what is being thrown out, it isn't practical. Powers asked what they are saying. Vein responded that they are saying that that proposal doesn't work, we need more money for infrastructure. He added that everyone says we need more money, but it can't be funded on the back of the locals, we are looking for more federal funds to be available to be able to do infrastructure projects; a lot of that is street and highways, but it will be looked at for other major infrastructure projects such as sewer and water as well, but the infrastructure was primarily for street and highway funding.

Grasser reported that their analysis, things that they've observed over time when they were using federal dollars, a lot of times using federal dollars can add 10, 15, 20 percent to the cost of the project because of all the processes we have to use when using that money; having consultants doing all the extra things we have to do with the project development and stuff, so their concern with what they've run into before is that even if you use a small part of federal dollars for larger projects, now all of a sudden those federal requirements apply to that whole project, so you can get pretty quickly to a point where at 20 percent you have to question if it is even worthwhile taking that money because of the encumbrances that come with it.

Haugen said that he would agree that the Trump proposal might not have a good chance, but he believes the NDDOT is using it in its messaging to the State Legislatures, in principle, of what could happen and where that would rest with North Dakota if it were to happen, so that's putting their staff in a little bit of a conundrum as to they need to help us but then there is the broader messaging that is trying to leverage or work the legislative system to come up with a State funding system that isn't every two years, but is a longer term State program, so he thinks the general agreement that the Trump proposal being presented is not likely to be what is finalized, but they are relying on that proposal as a message for State revenue to be raised at the North Dakota level.

Vein asked if, just for the State of North Dakota, the Governor has this Downtown Initiative, has there been reallocation of State funds for those projects, away from other projects. Haugen responded that there has been, those are principally federal funds that have been reprogrammed towards the Mainstreet Initiative. Vein said, though, that we haven't had anything that's been negative toward any of our

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

projects. Haugen responded that they spread the pain out quite a bit. He explained that a few months ago he did show you what the impact to our annual estimate of funding is, and prior to the FAST ACT, we were assuming, and these are round numbers, \$2.5 million dollars a year; after the FAST ACT we might have been running \$2.7 million dollars, and now with the Mainstreet Initiative we are back to about \$2.6 million dollars, so we still have an increase in our annual estimate, because of FAST, but it isn't as great anymore because of the Mainstreet Initiative, so it has reallocated funds but the impact to each individual City has not been that great, and it has opened up a funding stream for some projects that otherwise wouldn't likely be programmed and funded.

Haugen commented that because this is now being classified as a permanent program, that is one of the struggles that the NDDOT is having as to how much we, as and MPO, can rely on it to help fund us on an annual basis or, we talked about, every third year or something that we can plug in a project that will come from that program.

b. Universe Of Projects

Haugen stated that staff has been working with the Technical Advisory Committee on generating what are all the known improvements that are already programmed or have been identified as being needed from past studies like our I-29 Study, what is in our current Long Range Transportation Plan; so they generated a spreadsheet. He explained that they have not shared this information with the board because it is still being digested at the staff level.

Haugen reported that they weeded out some projects that may be duplicates. He added that he will tell you that right now the running total of that is approximately over \$700 million dollars in projects being identified, some of them, again, are projects that are currently programmed. He said that the bulk of that money is money that is going to be beyond our financial capability with our known resources. He added that it is the typical way of how we address the planning is that we identify all of the projects that have been thought out, and start ranking them on their merits and their fiscal ability to be funded.

Vein said that it is a large number, and that doesn't surprise him, but over what time period were you thinking that that would be planned to be spent, the \$700 million, is that a ten year timeframe. Haugen responded that it is out to 2045. He added that, again, it also includes roughly \$70 million that is already programmed in our T.I.P., so a small chunk has already been allocated and specified for projects.

Haugen stated that he would expect that at the April meeting you will be presented with the master list of, these are all the projects that we have identified, with the help of our public.

c. Future Bridge Study Status

Haugen reported that we did have a Special Joint Future Bridge Location meeting on February 22, at the Grand Forks County Building. He stated that at the meeting, those MPO Executive Policy Board members that were in attendance did pass a motion that we go to each individual City Council to get a recommendation from them. He said that the last two weeks staff has been at the East Grand Forks City Council meetings, and the next two weeks staff will be at the Grand Forks City Council meetings, so at the April meeting we will hopefully have recommendations from both City Councils to help us with the local bridge issue.

d. PM2 and PM3 Information

Haugen reported that these are the federally required performance measures. He said that included in the packet was a presentation of information that he will go over briefly.

Haugen stated that, again, you have measures that are talking about our pavement and bridge conditions, that is the PM2. He said that these performance measures, from a federal perspective, are only focused on our NHS System and Interstate, so this is a map that just reinforces that the red roadways are the roadways that the PM2 is focused on.

Haugen commented that they want us to identify a target that shows us what we are allowing as a percent of pavement in good, pavement in poor, on the different Interstate and Non-Interstate System. He explained that there are different ways to calculate that, and he did include the information in case you are interested in it. He added that there is an evaluation of how you are performing, from a federal perspective, because this does get into a penalty clause, so this is an example of asphalt surface, there are three criteria that you have to report on, if two of the three are in poor condition, then the overall section is poor. He stated that we have to report a two year target and a four year target.

Haugen reported that the Non-Interstate NHS condition does not mandate that we set a target for it, but there is new pavement criteria that the feds are requiring that typically isn't being used by Interstate DOT, so that is why they get an allowance for the Non-Interstate and not have a two year target initially, but they will have to have a four year target.

Haugen commented that the State of Minnesota has presented to us what they believe to be their proposed targets, you will see that the Non-Interstate, the poor condition is a little bit higher than for the Interstate System, but the good is the same. He said that the State of Minnesota is fairly confident because of their predictability that models that they have been using with their pavement, and even though there is a new criteria, they are going to be able to be fairly below the poor performance targets they are identifying.

Haugen stated that North Dakota is unknown, frankly North Dakota has been slow to the table on identifying what measures data they have available and how they shake out as far as on the Statewide system. He added that there is a May 20, 2018 deadline for the State to make that performance target for pavement and bridge and report it to Federal Highway, so there is a short timeline now for North Dakota to proceed in a fast manner to come up with those.

Haugen reported that there is a similar percent for good for Bridge condition. He said there are calculations that show what information was used, and how they used the different systems to come up with what is good and what is poor. He added that he would like to remind everyone that culverts are classified as a bridge if they are over a certain size.

Haugen commented that, again, there is a two year target. He added that the performance on bridges is not separated by what is on the Interstate versus Non-Interstate, it applies to all the NHS Routes.

Haugen stated that, again, Minnesota has presented their proposed targets, and North Dakota is still an unknown on theirs. He added that there are penalties for this PM2 provision, and from what they are

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

hearing from most States is that the federal target threshold for these penalties to be imposed, neither State can fathom a scenario in which they would have the penalty imposed on them unless for some reason pavements all became extremely poor at the same time.

Haugen reported that the next target is the PM3. He explained that this really talks about reliability, how reliable our system is for both passenger and freight vehicles.

Haugen stated that for the personal passenger vehicle types, the reliability measure applies to, again, all of the routes shown in red, including the Interstate. He added that the freight reliability is only applying to the Interstate System and not to the rest of the system.

Haugen commented that there are two year and four year targets for both of these. He added that there is probe vehicles that takes place, and to give you some idea what time of day that we need to report on reliability for passenger vehicles. He said that for freight it is a different time period.

Haugen stated that one nice thing that is being provided by Federal Highway is a web-based tool that they have. He explained that they are collecting this data through a third party vendor, that third party vendor is utilizing a consortium of East Coast Universities, so to create this tool we just need to go into the website, focus in on our MPO area, and it will report out these PM3 travel time incidences for us so the work is very marginal. He added that the data is being collected on a national contract bases and is being imported, free of charge, for the NHS System. He said that they are collecting the data on the rest of the federal aid system, but there is a fee for that and Minnesota is possibly going to be purchasing that option for us; as, if you recall, our travel demand model that we use that software program, North Dakota provides that to all three MPOs and the State, that is similar to how the Minnesota contract with that tool will be able to provide us with the same data that is being reported for travel time reliability.

Haugen commented that the one thing about PM3 is there is no penalty if we aren't meeting our targets.

Haugen said that the last thing he has is Greenhouse Gas, which is technically a requirement for us, however both our Federal friends and State friends are informing us that they expect this to be rescinded so they are advising us not to even bother spending much time on that measure, even though, technically it is required at the end of May as well.

Haugen reported that once we have that information as to where the Statewide targets are, the MPO then has 180 days, which gets us into the middle of November, to make a decision on whether to use the States targets or adopt our own targets for at least two measures.

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. Minnesota FHWA T.I.P. Guidance On Incorporating Performance Measures

Haugen reported that last month we talked about the Draft Minnesota Guidance on Incorporating Performance Measures into our T.I.P., and the decision we made was to wait until we absolutely have to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

do a T.I.P. amendment. He said that that draft guidance became final, so he is just reporting that that is now a final guidance on the Minnesota side only.

b. NDDOT Advised To Hold On Underpass Study

Haugen reported that we took action to amend our Work Program to initiate a study of the Washington Street Underpass. He explained that the NDDOT is advising us to hold off on initiating an RFP on this, and are still having discussions as to when the timing of their project development process will be started, so that is the reason you are not seeing an RFP on this months agenda, is because the NDDOT is advising us to hold on that. He added that, as we discussed when we approved that work program amendment, we were just getting ourselves set up in case that is the route that ended up going, and we advised you that we may not even undertake that route, and it appears to be what is going on now, so then that would free up the \$60,000 we had set aside for that study for another study to be done.

Vein asked how much money we have available for studies. Haugen responded that we are right around \$200,000, which needs the local match, so \$250,000 total.

c. Add Downtown Transportation Planning To FY2018 UPWP

Haugen commented that we did discuss this already a bit. He explained that the City of Grand Forks is doing a Downtown Master Plan, and the have approached the MPO to look at some transportation components of that; one of those that we discussed was the Bike/Ped. He said that he talked a little bit about the transit component, and, again, what we are trying to do is to see if we can shift mode share away from personal vehicles because the DeMers project is not going to provide us with the capacity that is being forecasted.

Haugen stated that some of the other things Grand Forks has talked about is parking, looking at the parking, not so much the current availability, but more on how to ensure that as development occurs that parking is taken care of adequately.

Haugen reported that one thing that was discussed, and he may not be able to explain it very good right now, but there is this concept of “smart transportation technology”, and that gets into some of the things you hear about connected vehicle with, for example, traffic signals whereby vehicles are now coming with the ability of receiving data from traffic signals or other transportation infrastructure to inform them on what is the best route, the likelihood that the signals are going to change from yellow to red, etc., and some of that technology will be allowed to download on smart phones; or other users so you can have information when the ped timing will be at the signals, so some of that might be in the scope of work. He added that they have reached out to East Grand Forks to see if there are things of interest to share with the Minnesota side, so we are still fashioning up what that RFP or scope of work might look at, but that \$250,000 he discussed, some of that will be eaten up by the Downtown Transportation Planning element.

Haugen stated that one other thing they asked was about the Bike/Ped bridge downtown, but, as we discussed at our last meeting it was decided that it is probably premature to try to get into that; but there still might be a possibility of something being fashioned in the work program for next months amendment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, March 21st, 2018**

Information only.

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that the 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update is included for review.

b. Bill Listing For The 2/17/18 to 3/16/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the February 17, 2018 to March 16, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 21ST, 2018,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:53 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager