

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Secretary, called the April 18th, 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 (Via Conference Call), Jeannie Mock, and Al Grasser.

Guest(s): David Kuharneko, Grand Forks Engineering; Brian Bourdon, Kimley-Horn; and Scott Mareck, WSB.

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

Vetter declared a quorum was present.

SUSPEND AGENDA

Vetter reported that we are going to make one change in the agenda to accommodate Mr. Vein by moving Agenda Item #10c.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

c. Future Bridges

Haugen reported that included in the packet is a copy of the power point presentation he will be going over today.

Haugen commented that, per the Executive Policy Board's directive, staff went to each of the four governing bodies that make up the MPO Board. He said that we did go to; or heard from all four agencies.

Haugen stated that East Grand Forks City Council action was to recommend just focusing on 24th or 32nd Avenues for the local traffic. He said that Grand Forks City Council action was to recommend we continue to look at all four; and that we consider adding in 17th Avenue as well. He added that he met with Polk County Commission yesterday, and they are not taking any official action, they are relying on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

Mr. Strandell to represent them and vote their conscious. He added that they did talk about Merrifield as being the one that they have supported in the past, and also that any other location would be problematic for them to be partnering in. He said that the reason that Merrifield is something they have supported in the past is because it easily ties in to their County Highway System at Polk 58 and Polk 225. He asked that Mr. Malm please report on what the Grand Forks County Commission discussion has been on this issue.

Malm reported that they did discuss this at two meetings and feel that the only location they would have any participation in would be Merrifield, as the rest fall outside of their jurisdiction, but they won't oppose any of the rest of them.

Haugen said that when they were discussing this with the Grand Forks City Council they indicated that they were interested in what impact an interchange at 47th and I-29 would have on our model; so they did run that scenario. He added that, just as the 32nd Avenue Interchange does not create a strong connection between the bridge traffic and the interchange, they found the same to be with 47th Avenue, when they ran that scenario with an interchange at 47th. He stated that they did not rerun 24th or 32nd with an interchange at 47th; but, depending on what they do they may run those in the future.

Haugen referred to the slide presentation and went over it briefly.

Haugen stated that one thing they did notice, as they were discussing making other model changes, is how exactly they were modeling 47th Avenue on the Minnesota side. He pointed out that while it looks, on paper, that it is a nice roadway network that's here, existing in the rural area, when you look at the actual condition of the road, this extension of Rhinehart Drive to the south, you can see that it converts from a paved rural road to a gravel rural road. He stated that in previous model runs they have treated this as all being gravel, and as a gravel rural road our model doesn't attract the same type of traffic it would if it were a County paved highway. He added that 32nd Avenue, or what would be the extension of 32nd Avenue in East Grand Forks is also half gravel and half paved, so what they decided to do was to see what the model would be if we paved all of Rhinehart to the new bridge crossing but not change the model in any other way and it does attract slightly more traffic across the 47th Avenue Bridge, and these model runs were done without the interchange.

Haugen commented that included in the packet is updated information. He pointed out that you can see that it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 more cars a day across the bridge; most of that traffic is coming from the Point area of East Grand Forks versus the Mallory Bridge location. He referred to a slide and pointed out that it shows how the traffic has changed out there at the Mallory Bridge, it is virtually the same because we aren't making any changes to the east/west rural roads, the only road we are making a change to is the north/south road and that is attracting more traffic from the Point area in East Grand Forks. He stated that it does impact the benefits, or the decrease in the vehicle miles and vehicle hours traveled; but they aren't going in the right direction from a benefit point of view, there is less of a benefit because the decrease is less.

Haugen stated that we are also stressing that we have a transportation plan that needs to be adopted and delivered by the end of this year, so if we are going to do any further analysis of any bridge sites, there is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

additional information that is being requested, so in order to keep a timeline we need to make some quick decisions, maybe some can be made today. He added that later on in the presentation, he has been working with our State partners and our Consultants to get some idea of what that additional scope of work might look like, so he will go through that right now.

Haugen reported that during the five-year period after the 1997 flood, until the MPO Executive Policy Board made the decision on 32nd and Merrifield, and has carried that over for the last couple of updates, we did a lot of analysis at all these different river crossings.

Haugen referred to slides of each of the proposed river crossings and went over the information for each briefly.

Haugen commented that in working with our State and Federal partners they have asked that we sort of “dummy down” the information that is displayed on these drawings. He said that that would mean not showing what might be construed as a precise alignment, not showing any slopes on the drawings, any stationing, etc. He said, then, that if we are going look at any additional data we would have to update these documents to “dummy” them down a bit and be more generic in our crossing alignment.

Haugen said that we did obviously, back then, do a lot of the cost estimating, a benefit/cost analysis, and noted if any homes or businesses would need to be purchased for these sites, so that would be information that we could simply update to reflect today’s conditions for Elks Drive or 24th Avenue, or 25th Avenue, the same basic information, just dummy it down. He added that we have the same for 32nd, the one change on 32nd is that that is the only site, previously, where identified actual homes that had to be displaced, our partners would ask us not to do try to identify homes and such, but we could still identify a number, we just can’t physically show them on a map, where they would be located.

Haugen stated that 47th was not studied in any detail back then, so we don’t have any detailed information for that location, so that would be the one that would require the most work. He added that we would have to get direction from the MPO Executive Policy Board as to how we treat the road network on the Minnesota side; not only to add in cost of improvement of Rhinehart Drive, but also if you want to talk at all about flood level information, all of this mile stretch would be outside the East Grand Forks flood protection system, so if we are trying to get anything near a high and dry analysis that whole stretch of roadway would have to be looked at as well.

Haugen said that for Merrifield we do have the detailed Bridge Feasibility Study, so we would update the costs on that, but he isn’t sure there is much other detailed information that we would need to do on the Merrifield site.

Haugen stated that this is sort of the questions staff has for this body as to whether we want to go to the next level of analysis, gather data, and if so do we want to add in 17th Avenue, or do we want to delete locations. He said that if we continue on with 47th, how do you want us to treat the issue of the Minnesota road network.

Vein said that he thinks the issue is the difference between a political solution and a technical solution; and he is saying that the political solution is basically having which neighborhood in Grand Forks that is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

included and which ones are not; and if he is trying to interpret the Grand Forks City Council wanting to go back and study them all was to make sure that we are open and transparent in didn't arbitrarily leave somebody out that somebody else would complain about, so the idea would be the we go forward and hope to come up with the best solution for both communities, but also address the political nature again on the Grand Forks side and we treat everybody consistent and equal as we go forward. He said that he knows that may have some impact on cost, but in the long run it will behoove us and we can make the best informed decision that we can, so the likelihood of some of those is probably not very good, but having been around when this thing went through some twenty years ago or whatever, it is going to be very political and this is just one of the tools we are looking for to help us address that political issue, just include them all.

Vetter asked if Mr. Haugen is looking for a motion of some sort of which ones we want to continue studying. Haugen responded that the question would be, is it simply okay to update the information for the sites that we have already done a lot of the work for as best we can, if the answer is yes, then the only site we would need to do a lot of work on is 47th Avenue. He said that if we are continuing on with 47th Avenue, then the next question is, how do we treat the Minnesota roads as part of that, and if we aren't continuing on with 47th then are we continuing on with all the rest of the sites, and are we adding in 17th Avenue.

Grasser commented that Mr. Haugen brings up an interesting question; because the roads are gravel on the East Grand Forks side we need to address them, but the question he has in his mind is on the Grand Forks side they have been paved already, but he isn't sure they have sufficient structure, cross section, pedestrian facilities, traffic control, and whatnot, necessarily to address all the bridge traffic on those scenarios, and he is actually wondering if we shouldn't take a look at that as well. He added that 24th is an old classified street, it has some mill and overlay and we see how traffic has been impacting those types of streets; and 32nd is in bad shape, and then if we bring some of that additional traffic do we need to put in round-a-bouts, or a traffic signal or something in there to handle the additional traffic, he would be interested in knowing what that transportation impact is on both sides of the river to connect us to some reasonable higher arterial street. He stated that Belmont is a pretty narrow street in a number of those locations; and he knows that you aren't looking to expand the scope, but he thinks that we should be taking a look at some of that, so he would think the first step would be to do traffic counts; what do we need, for how many x amount of traffic at intersections do we have to upgrade that intersection to what, if we're missing, like 24th Avenue he knows there is a large stretch there that is missing sidewalks, bikepaths, or anything, so what would be the expectation of upgrading those types of facilities, and at what cost.

Haugen responded that on 24th the question would be, are we truly looking at the Elks Drive alignment. He pointed out that we did receive a letter from the Grand Forks Historical Society asking us not to continue looking at 24th. He said that he would have to agree with a lot of impediments it would impose to try to push one directly through 24th, so that would be another question, are we truly going to use the alignment of Elks as a possible alignment because when we do it right at the 24th Avenue the traffic will go in a straight line for the most part, but when you use the Elks Drive location it starts to split, north south, and then as it goes south it splits again at 32nd, so it does make a difference in the analysis we do.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

Haugen stated, though, that we do have for 32nd, 47th, and Merrifield, that traffic volume number already in-hand, so if we add 17th we don't have them, and if we do 24th we would have to agree to do the Elks location to tie it on the North Dakota side.

Vein said that he was thinking, for the purposes of this study, that we should have flexibility between 24th going straight or Elks, as it could potentially be one or the other and that would maybe be something that we would discuss further if in fact that became the preferred location so it wouldn't get bogged down too much on going straight on 24th or jogging over to Elks Drive. Haugen responded that the Travel Demand Model will make a difference in the traffic volumes we would analyze along 24th Avenue, how we tie it in to the river location.

Haugen commented that we have the information as a straight run on 24th Avenue right now, but we would need another model run to get the new information, but you are just adding, again another location, kind of a sub-location on the 24th area for us to come up with the information you are seeking on the traffic impacts. He said that it isn't impossible to do. Vein responded that he isn't thinking they need to have another one, but he thinks it needs to be acknowledged that if we use the 24th Avenue information we have years before it would happen, so we may have to look more at the impacts Elks Drive would have, but he doesn't think we want to add another location to this study. Haugen asked if that includes not adding 17th Avenue. Vein responded that it does not include not adding 17th Avenue.

Grasser stated that he isn't sure how to get to a speedy resolution for this, but it seems like one of the first things we need to do is to try to get 47th Avenue back up to kind of the same standard we are going to use for the other locations, just getting that so we have that full plate, that's really just adding the one, if he understands correctly. He added that he is also wondering if there are some of these that may get kicked out, and he is curious to know if the Historical Society, the local group is not happy with it but do they have the ability to stop a certain location, and he is also wondering if we should talk to the Corps of Engineers to see if there is a concern on their part relative to the soil stability, or flow of the river or something like that, if we ran these by them and found out if there is one that is particularly good or bad, from their perspective, because he knows right now we are focusing on the traffic, but if we are trying to get to a quick resolution we probably should have some knowledge about the other areas too so we don't pick one based on traffic and then find out that for some reason the Corps of Engineers says it is the worst spot in the world to pick.

Vetter said that, getting back to Mr. Vein's original comment, this study is hopefully going to alleviate some of the political ramifications; if he is hearing things right we are leaning to keeping all of the sites in the study and adding 17th Avenue, so if that is the case then we just need a motion in that direction so Mr. Haugen and his staff can proceed.

Mock commented that she has some concern with the 24th Avenue site being considered as both Elks Drive and 24th Avenue in straight flow. She said that she doesn't think that was a bit of confusion not her understanding that opened those sites for being considered, and she is getting calls and entire neighborhoods and people that haven't all been in the Historical Society, so there is a great deal of tension to that. She stated that she doesn't know if Elks Drive would alleviate some of that or if that would just cause a whole host of other people calling opposing that location, so she is a little concerned

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

to have a site that means you can either cross here or here and kind of the real world impasse of that for those neighborhoods and what that means in terms of comments and the analysis.

Haugen explained that the reason for his comment about bringing in Elks Drive is because the Historical Society is going to be protected under Section 106 of NEPA, and that is very similar to park land, 4F and 6F, so if there are alternatives that avoid the 106 property, that would be the first choice, and honestly we looked at Elks Drive as a way to avoid that 106 property before, so that is why the history of the past, why it came up as not being a direct connection to 24th Avenue. Grasser commented, then, that the fact that there is some private property between the County Historical and Elks Drive means it doesn't have that protection you're talking about. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Mock stated that she thinks her comment is more toward public transparency, should it be called Elks Drive instead of 24th Avenue so that people understand that is the crossing site we are looking at, and what the impact would be if placed there.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE KEEPING ALL FOUR LOCATIONS IN AS ORIGINALLY PLANNED, AND ADD 17TH AVENUE.

Grasser asked if this motion includes the name clarification that Ms. Mock was just talking about; Elks Drive being a separate location from 24th Avenue going straight. Vein responded that he knows there is a difference in location, but he didn't know if we needed to be that precise, because he can go with whichever works the easiest is fine with him; keeping it at 24th because we know that when we get into details we might look at Elks Drive would work, he would be satisfied with that, but if you think we need to say Elks Drive, that might open up another can of worms, he doesn't think this does that at all, what the actual intent was, but we better be able to clarify when we are done with this motion.

Grasser stated that he isn't sure the council understood the limitation of the historical property when we called it 24th Avenue, and that is why it seems like we might be initiating a conflict here with an organization that maybe isn't needed if we clarify it at Elks Drive, so he thinks that clarification would actually be helpful, from what he is hearing at this point. Vein responded that, with that comment, he would make that a part of his motion. Grasser said that he would concur.

Discussion continued.

Haugen asked if it was part of the motion that we would be updating this type of information that we have for these sites, and the only exception, since we don't have that same level of information for 47th, we would be generating that level of information. Vein responded that that was his intent.

Vetter stated that he believes that Mr. Vein's intent was to update the details for 47th Avenue, include 32nd, Elks, and 17th Avenue in the study. Strandell asked if it also includes Merrifield Road. Vetter responded that it does.

Motion with all inclusions reads as:

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE KEEPING THE ORIGINAL FOUR LOCATIONS OF 24TH AVENUE OR ELKS DRIVE, 32ND AVENUE, 47TH AVENUE, AND MERRIFIELD; TO ADD 17TH AVENUE; AND TO UPDATE INFORMATION FOR ALL LOCATIONS.

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

Voting Nay: Strandell.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers and DeMers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT AMENDMENT #4 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Haugen reported that the action you just took is going to increase some costs that we don't have currently in our work program, so we need to make an amendment to our work program to set aside some funds to pay for this additional study that we just described. He said that the original Agenda Item #8 was to also include the request to do downtown planning, but at the Technical Advisory Committee the City of Grand Forks requested that it be taken off, but we still have included in the work program budgeting \$60,000 towards this additional work you just approved the MPO undertake.

Vein commented that the Grand Forks City Council made a decision to do a more elaborate study of the future development of the downtown; there is a number of potential projects taking place, there is the widening of DeMers Avenue or the reconstruction, there is a Main Street Initiative the Governor Bergum has put forth that a number of people went to take part in looking at pedestrian traffic, bicycle traffic, zoning, parking, a wide range of things that we need to look at as we look to the future to better utilize our downtown space. He said that they have done a number of individual plans, but they thought it might be best to take what they have already and put it together into a comprehensive plan that is inclusive of all the things we have done to-date, and to take advantage of maybe some current thought process and experienced consultants, so the City of Grand Forks is right now in the process of getting consultants that will help us with some of that planning. He added that he thinks the idea was that as a piece of that there would be transportation planning and that the MPO would be able to do that portion of the study, not the entire study by any means, but that portion that would relate to transportation. He stated that he thinks that when they talked to Mr. Haugen about that there were study funds available, and it was thought that this might be a good way to utilize some of that funding specifically to downtown Grand Forks.

Haugen responded that that is originally what this was, the main driving force behind this amendment was to include that work, but at last week's Technical Advisory Committee meeting the City staff asked us to delay taking action on this, but there are a couple other components to this amendment that staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are asking the Board to update our work program on.

Haugen stated that the first one is that we are now able to finalize our actual federal dollars, and that is what the table on the front page of the Staff Report is attempting to accomplish, to show what the actual available FY2018 dollars are versus what we had assumed. He explained that now that our audit is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

complete we now know how much FY2017 dollars we have remaining that can be rolled in with our FY2018 dollars. He pointed out that we have about \$20,000 less than we anticipated, so that give us about \$126,000 in additional funding that we have not assigned to a work activity. He said that we were going to set aside half of that to go to the Downtown Plan, and the other half was to take care of the additional river crossing analysis; so it is a three part amendment with the Downtown Plan now being put on hold, we still need action to finalize the actual revenue and to assign a dollar value to the future river crossing analysis.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #4 TO THE FY2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM; TO FINALIZE OUR REVENUES, AND TO ASSIGN A DOLLAR VALUE TO THE ADDITIONAL RIVER CROSSING ANALYSES/WORK REQUESTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers and DeMers.

Haugen stated that we still have some of that revenue unallocated to a specific project, so there are still some funds available to do the Downtown Plan, or if that isn't done, to assign to another activity.

Malm asked how soon a decision would have to be made by the City of Grand Forks to have the MPO assist with their Downtown Plan. Haugen responded that the longer they wait to ask us for the funds the more likely other projects may be requested for that funding.

Haugen commented that there still is, from the North Dakota Statewide perspective there is still the push to make sure that all MPOs are spending their federal funds in the year they are allocated to them, we still have a distribution formula issue out there, so we would seek to get these funds identified and assigned to a work activity sooner rather than later.

Grasser asked, if you were going to do a downtown study would you have to go through the advertising and selection process for consultants. Haugen responded that we would. He explained that the intent of getting this into our work program was to get that process out of the way and set aside the funds for that activity, and then, as we normally do, we would draft up the specific RFP, have that go through the Technical Advisory Committee and this body, release it and get the proposals in, review them and get a consultant under contract; so this was trying to speed up that lengthy process before we actually have to have someone under contract, but the request and motion just passed was to table that downtown plan.

RESUME AGENDA

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 21ST, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

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

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

Vein excused from meeting.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE FY2019-2022 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that typically in April we take action on draft T.I.P.s; this year we are only able to take action on the Minnesota side.

Haugen referred to the staff report and pointed out that we did identify that we did schedule a public hearing for this draft at this meeting so if you would like to open that public hearing that would be appropriate.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.

There was no one present for discussion.

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

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.

Haugen reported that the only real significant change is, if you recall, the State of Minnesota funded additional bus service for East Grand Forks, that was a two-year pilot program; but with this document the State of Minnesota is committing the funds for four years for that additional bus service.

Haugen stated that this did go through the District Offices to make sure that our T.I.P. and their documents are in-sync and both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending approval.

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT FY2019-2022 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF SELECTION OF CONSULTANT FOR CITY OF EAST GRAND FORKS' ADA RIGHT-OF-WAY TRANSITION PLAN

Kouba stated that back in January the City of East Grand Forks requested that we amend this into our work program. She said that in February we brought forward an RFQ and we received two submittals; our Selection Committee reviewed both submittals and chose SRF Consulting Group to do the project.

Kouba reported that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are requesting approval for the Chairman and the Executive Director to execute a contract with SRF Consulting Group to do the City of East Grand Forks' ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan, at a cost not to exceed \$35,000.00

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE ALLOWING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH SRF CONSULTING GROUP, INC., AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$35,000.00.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA 5339 AND 5310 CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Kouba reported that in February we solicited for projects for both FTA 5339 and 5310 Programs. She stated that the NDDOT has a deadline of May 1st, so we had to get this through the approval process in April. She commented that Cities Area Transit is the only entity that can bring forwards for both of these programs as they are the transit provider for the area.

Kouba stated that the five projects submitted for the 5339 Program are:

- 1) Medium Duty Bus
- 2) Digital Way Signs for their Transit Center
- 3) Destination Signs
- 4) Man-Lift
- 5) Bus Stop Way Signage

Kouba stated that the two projects submitted for the 5310 Program are:

- 1) Mobility Manager
- 2) ADA Replacement Van.

Kouba commented that the list of projects are in the priority order requested, and the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are requesting approval.

MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE FTA 5339 AND 5310 CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH OUR TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.

Haugen stated that before you is an announcement flier with dates of meetings that are scheduled on a proposed new route system, that hopefully will be implemented in July.

Haugen said that the other two items to discuss is, we were just talking about a 5339 Grant Request that Grand Forks submitted, and recently there was an announcement and media play about a grant that Cities Area Transit got from the 5339 Program in the amount of \$3.6 million dollars for the bus barn, which is great news.

Haugen commented that we will have to amend our Transit Development Plan in order to formally allow those funds to flow into our metro area, so you will receive from the MPO, and through your City Councils, a request to amend the Transit Development Plan to clean up the loose ends in that document. He said that that would also include the decision from the State of Minnesota to now finance four years of the East Grand Forks bus service as well.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF MINNESOTA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING

Haugen reported that this is a requirement of the FAST-ACT, because of the performance based planning that has been made a part of our transportation plan and programming processes. He explained that the FAST-ACT had a statement in there that there had to be an agreement between the State Department of Transportation, the Transit Operator, and the MPO on how the performance based planning information was gathered, how it was processed, and who had what responsibility, ???, so on the Minnesota side they drafted it up as a Memorandum of Understanding.

Haugen commented that this Memorandum of Understanding is a template that they worked through the Minnesota MPO Directors and the Minnesota Transit Operator Associations. He stated that the MOU is basically one page stating that we are agreeing to work together on this and the knowledge is that it is not a real binding document. He added that the follow-up is a separate document that allows, as new rules and regulations get implemented or promulgated by the feds, we can update the procedure end of this without having to go back and get signatures on the MOU, so it is a two part agreement and the East Grand Forks City Council, last night, agreed to sign the MOU as stated; the Technical Advisory Committee reviewed this, and they, along with staff, are recommending the Board also accept the MOU and receive the document as it is ???

MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING, AS PRESENTED.

Grasser asked if we are anticipating that once we get the information from North Dakota we may have two slightly different process that we are going to have to carry through. Haugen responded that we had

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

this discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and he followed up with the FM/COG Director, and we are of the opinion that since we have a Minnesota document that we are already agreeing to that the North Dakota one, unless there is something that indicate the Minnesota one has something that is purely a Minnesota process, which we don't believe there is, there shouldn't be a need for North Dakota to have a different document, so that we don't have two separate document. He added that North Dakota has not shared with us any draft of any document, but they did state that they were going to rely on the Minnesota document, but they also stated that they thought they may pare it down a bit.

Haugen commented that the FAST-ACT requires that this be adopted by the end of May.

Grasser stated that he has always had a concern about philosophical differences between Minnesota's approach and North Dakota's approach, and having to default on the Minnesota side of these processes. He said that North Dakota may pare it down a bit, those might be important paring downs, we don't know, so he isn't really comfortable agreeing to the Minnesota document, at least now.

Haugen reported that you do have another month to delay this. He said that he doesn't believe that Minnesota feels there is room to pare down, nor would there be a document that North Dakota would offer to Minnesota to use in its place. He added that all the things you see here are basically siting what the Federal Law states, and whose providing the data, whose gathering the data; where there would be differences would be naming of the offices within MnDOT from North Dakota.

Haugen stated that not knowing what North Dakota is even drafting, as they have not shared anything with us other than the comment. Grasser said, though, that they are under the same mandate aren't they, so they will have to have something. Haugen responded that they are.

Mock asked if we had an anticipated date when the North Dakota draft would be available. Haugen responded that, again, we do have a federal date of the end of May, so we, if we don't have a document before you before your next meeting, we will be missing that date, and he isn't sure what the ramification will be.

Grasser asked if, just thinking contingencies, can we adopt this and then come back and reconsider if the North Dakota document has something different that we'd like to incorporate or pursue. Haugen responded that they would, based on Roberts Rules of Order, which allows a reconsideration at the next meeting. Grasser said, then, that would only allow us to reconsider one meeting. Grasser stated that, barring that concern of this, the commitment is for how long. Haugen responded that it is perpetual until parties agree to terminate then there is a 90-day termination process.

Grasser commented that what tends to follow these things also, is this might be the basic MOU, but then all the bureaucratic prophesies that then follow along in interpreting and implementing kind of follow too, and philosophically he struggles with that on a multi-state MPO the way we are, we'd have to default to this because of North Dakota DOT's typically less bureaucratic. He stated that he would like to see at least a draft of what they've got in mind.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

Mock said that it does say that “or until replaced by a new MOU” so she would assume that if there was something with the North Dakota MOU that we wanted to pursue, if we were already within the terms of this agreement, we could propose a new MOU and address it that way as well. Grasser added that it does say that it is not legally binding.

Grasser stated that he would prefer to wait a month.

MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO AMEND HER MOTION TO TABLE APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING ON PROCESS FOR PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING MOU UNTIL THE MAY 16TH, 2018, MEETING.

Haugen reported that if we do wish to go with a different draft you also have to go through the East Grand Forks City Council process as well, and all within that May timeframe.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

a. Universe Of Projects

Haugen reported that as we mentioned last meeting, we were working with your staff to try to come up with this Universe of Projects list, and we are sharing the current draft with you today.

Haugen referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and commented that as we discussed we had over \$700 million dollars of projects identified; we had them categorized as things that are already programmed in your current T.I.P. document; things that are on the Travel Demand Model Network as being placed by 2045; and we have some other planning documents that we are incorporating in here, the safety ones from the Safety Plan, the State of Good Repair, the bulk of those are projects that are yet to be done in our 2045 plan, but the large dollar amount is projects that have been identified in various studies and with no funding necessary to make improvements we don't have the means to put them in a fiscally constrained document.

Haugen commented that of the \$454 million dollars, we do have all four of the river crossing options included so that means we can take \$100+ million of that right off the top, so that makes that number a little less startling.

Haugen referred to the project tables and went over them briefly. He stated that they continue to work with your staff to make final refinements to the list, and that gives us, then, what is our universe of projects that we need to try to figure out our priorities, which ones fit within the fiscally constrained Long Range Transportation Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 18th, 2018**

Grasser asked if the map is fiscally constrained for the entire Universe of Projects. Haugen pointed out that the map he is showing is just the Discretionary Projects, projects that aren't part of the T.I.P., Safety Plan, or our current Long Range Transportation Plan.

Information only.

b. PM3

Haugen reported that this is Travel Time Reliability performance measure that we are required by the FAST-ACT. He stated that we went through more detail last month, this month we will show you what information is available currently on this measure.

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

Haugen commented that one of the things to note is that the Feds are still trying to get their data sets in-sync with the requirements of the years we have to make decisions on. He said that currently the tool that we go to get the maps you will see later on, they don't have the current NHS system in place, so on the Minnesota side we have some additional roadways that aren't truly NHS roadways showing up on their mapping system and on the North Dakota side there are some that aren't on the NHS showing up and some that are on the NHS not showing up.

Haugen stated that it will be this type of mapping that the States will have to make their decision on by the end of May; we have 180 days, and within that 180 days this mapping tool will have the updated NHS system so routes like the ones shown will be taken off, 5th Street will be taken off, plus we will have 2018 data so we will have more up-to-date data from the MPO perspective to consider how we want to set those targets at.

Information only.

d. Open House April 18th

Haugen reported that we do have our third public meeting on the Street/Highway Element tonight at the Choice Wellness and Fitness Center. He added that Mr. Bourdon is here for a short overview on what will be presented tonight.

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

Information only.

OTHER BUSINESS

- 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.

- c. NDDOT March 14th Funding Symposium

Haugen stated that this morning he sent you notification that the NDDOT has finally put on their website the information they shared at the Funding Symposium they held on March 14th, so you now have that information available for your review.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO ADJOURN THE MARCH 21ST, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:20 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager