

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

**Wednesday, June 20th, 2018 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the June 20th, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:03 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

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

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MAY 16TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 16TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF UPWP AMENDMENT #5

Haugen referred to the updated table and explained that the first thing we are amending is; back in February or March we amended our Work Program to do an update of our Washington Street Underpass Study to help with the planning development process. He said that we did not initiate that study because the NDDOT asked us to put it on hold while they figured out the exact approach they wanted to take on developing that project, and they have now given us work that they don't need to have us do that study, they will do it through their project development process, so that freed up \$80,000 that we had identified for that study.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

Haugen reported that MnDOT approached us to look at their #220 North Corridor; the major intersection there of U.S. #2 and #220 North or Gateway Drive and Central Avenue which has a high crash history that MnDOT would like to address sooner than later, and as part of that there is some interest in some other connecting roadways that East Grand Forks would also be interested in having us take a look at. He said, then, that MnDOT asked us to initiate a corridor study, so we have placed this project in lieu of the underpass study and MnDOT said that they would provide the 20% local match, so that is one part of what is being amended today.

Haugen commented that the other part of what is being amended is the U.S. #2/U.S. Business #2 intersection study which we have been carrying for a number of years. He added that when we entered this year's work program Grand Forks staff had indicated that they would like the MPO to do some downtown transportation planning, and the weren't quite sure how much or what amount etc. it would entail, so we had not initiated the intersection study because we were using it as a sort of placeholder for whatever the downtown planning would be. He said that in April we tried to amend the work program to do some downtown planning, but we ended up holding off on that and instead we budgeted the remaining unused funding to this one line item, so now we are here asking to do both, to continue doing the intersection study and to include the downtown transportation planning study for Grand Forks.

Haugen reported that we are splitting the budget equally between the two studies, and we will start both of them in this work program and will carry them both over to next year's program and will commit some resources next year to finish them, so when we do our next two-year work program, 2019-2020, you will see the completion of these two studies included in it.

Haugen summarized that the amendment then it to switch out the Washington Underpass Study that NDDOT no longer wishes us to do and to replace it with the 220 North Study and to split the remaining funds between the U.S. #2/U.S. Business #2 Intersection Study and the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Planning Study.

Vein asked if the scope of work has been defined for the Downtown Transportation Planning Study or is it still being worked on between Mr. Haugen and Meredith Richards. Haugen responded that it is still being worked on. He added that the expectation is that the MPO Executive Policy Board will see the defined scope of work for that project that they will be sending out in an RFP for approval from the MPO Executive Policy Board. He commented that the board will actually be seeing a defined scope of work in an RFP for all three of these items over the next few months.

Haugen reported that for the Downtown Transportation Planning Study there going to be a run at the NDDOT to see if the way the RPG Planning Group was hired/selected could be used as a way for us to accept one of the sub-consultants for our work. He added that Ms. Richards is preparing a package to present to the NDDOT, and in his discussions with her about this we will send it off to them, but he isn't overly hopeful that they will concur with that request, and they will require that we go through our own process. Vein asked how long that process takes. Haugen responded that, assuming that we get approval of the RFP at our next meeting we then have to advertise twenty-one days, then as fast as we can meet to make a selection, so middle of August would be a fair estimate. Vein asked if once we do the selection and negotiations, might some of these numbers change depending on how the negotiations go. Haugen

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

responded that, again, these numbers are assuming half of the project cost right now, so yes, we will show the final numbers in our 2019 program so we will build off of what is here and add in 2019 that last negotiated amount and make up the difference between \$55,000 and whatever the final cost is. He added that obviously we originally had \$110,000 for a consultant for the Downtown Transportation Planning Study, as that is what was in the ballpark of what the City of Grand Forks was asking us to consider having North Dakota approve the work that RPG had priced out. Vein asked if they were able to meet with any of the RPG people. Haugen responded that other than the 4:00 p.m. meeting that the Steering Committee held, no.

Vein asked if we have enough funds for this year for the scope that we need to get done now. He commented that the downtown plan is supposed to be done next April correct. Haugen responded that it is within that timeframe. Vein added that that is when the plan is supposed to be done but there is a lot of work that needs to be done in front of that, so he doesn't know what that timeline will exactly look like. Haugen commented that one of the first items they are asking the MPO to focus on is parking. He added that they are still scoping out what the RFP will actually be asking to do.

Vein stated that the name of the firm that Grand Forks hired is RPG. Haugen added that that is who they hired to do the non-transportation stuff. Vein said, though, that they also hired KLJ to do the design work on DeMers Avenue. Grasser commented that he isn't sure, he is losing track of which contractor is working for who, and some of them are being shared as well. Vein said that he believes that KLJ wasn't originally part of the proposal but the City asked that they be part of that proposal because they had moved the DeMers Avenue reconstruction to next year and in order to expedite that process they had to take on the traffic engineering portion, and part of that is also into the streetscape and bump outs, etc., which will all be incorporated into the plan and done on a fast-track basis compared to our normal timeline, so DeMers is going to be done that way.

Grasser said, to build off of that, the information they need to get to the DOT for the DeMers Avenue Construction project has a June, July and August timeframe, so a lot of those aesthetic type features of the downtown area is going to start to be cast in the next two months. He added that he thinks that the MPO work program will have to help out with that.

Mock commented then, that with that study the scope of work includes the survey and public and input and more of the streetscape, this scope of work will include just the transportation aspect so they would meet but they won't overlap.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #5 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO FY2018 ANNUAL ELEMENT OF THE 2018-2021 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that we did advertise a public hearing on this item for today's meeting so if you would open up the public hearing to see if anyone has any comments.

Vein opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Vein closed the public hearing.

Haugen stated that this was a fairly simple T.I.P. amendment; however it got complicated really fast and then it was brought back to a really simple T.I.P. amendment again.

Haugen commented that several years ago the State of North Dakota received a statewide grant to help veteran mobility, and all but \$99,000 of those funds were spent, so that \$99,000 is available for someone to use. He said that even though it was a statewide grant the City of Grand Forks and its Transit staff were the lead implementers and organizers of that, so the agreement was that the City would get to use any remaining funds from that grant. He stated that they will be replacing some existing equipment on the transit vehicles that allow people to know where the bus is in relationship to their bus stop and the timing.

Haugen explained that the actual amendment in the T.I.P. describes the whole project, and the actual grant, and just changes the word "rural" to "urban". He said that that is the simple part.

Haugen commented that the convoluted part is that we are in this time sequence of transitioning from old ways of doing things to the new performance way of doing things, and we may have had to do quite a bit more documentation than we are ending up having to do with this one, but this will probably be the last T.I.P. amendment that will be this simple as future ones will need to incorporate a lot more language with all of the amendments that will have to be processed from this point forward.

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2018 NORTH DAKOTA SIDE T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.

Vein asked if Mr. Haugen knew when they would actually be installing this new equipment. Haugen responded that he thinks they are trying to get it done this fall. He added that this money is reaching it's expiration point so it really needs to be obligated by the end of the September, and FTA is pushing to have this equipment purchased and obligated before July.

Vein asked if this equipment will work on both sides. Haugen responded that that is a detail he does not know the answer to at this time, but he knows that East Grand Forks is purchasing new vehicles from State funds and they are using State dollars to purchase the new vehicle but there is an existing East Grand Forks bus that he isn't sure it will cover or not, but he will follow up on this question.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: None.

MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE

Haugen reported that this is an update of where we are currently at with the project list. He said that he thinks the three things you will see are:

- 1) We believe we have finalized the universal list of projects;
- 2) We have a draft financial plan that has some totals that you will see;
- 3) We will update you on the additional river crossing analysis we are doing.

Haugen stated that the first thing is we now believe we are very close to having just shy of \$900 million dollars of projects being listed. He pointed out that they are categorized into these categories:

- 1) T.I.P. Projects (\$70,774,035.00) – we have some projects that are already programmed in our T.I.P., funds are allocated to them and they should be happening, for the most part.
- 2) Existing plus Committed Network Projects (\$64,133,000.00) – so between now and 2045 both cities will have some growth, and in order for that growth to occur they have to provide somewhat of a basic road network in the new areas.
- 3) Safety Projects (\$18,004,936.00) – there have been safety plans developed in both communities, and we have identified projects to include safety.
- 4) Multimodal Projects, Streetscape Projects and Studies (\$31,000,000.00) – this is essentially the North Dakota Urban Grant program with the Main Street Initiative, there are projects identified for that – its roughly \$1 million a year.
- 5) 2045 Plan (\$349,350,727.00) – they started their base with projects that were still identified in the 2040 Plan and they also have some additional projects that have been developed since then to add to this. A large chunk of the additional funds Grand Forks has laid out what the possible project need for each of the federally eligible roadways are to give us a comprehensive understanding of the life of this plan, the type of needs there may be out there.
- 6) Discretionary Projects (\$363,614,742.00) – this is our additional river crossings, interchanges, additional underpasses, those types of projects.

Haugen referred to maps and explained that they give us some sense of where the projects are that are being identified by the different categories. He went over the maps briefly; adding that if anyone is interested in looking at individual projects there is this listing of projects on the MPO website. He added that the list was being updated Monday so those updates are not included yet, but it is 95% representative of the projects that have been identified. He said, again, that we are just shy of \$900 million dollars worth of listed projects that might be included in the fiscal constraint plan and might be carried over and all of them are illustrative or just a few of them will be carried over as projects that we would like to have done if funding can be found somewhere.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

Vein asked if these would be all of the projects that we would be identifying from today forward to 2045. Haugen responded that they are all projects that at one time or another been identified as something that some agency would like to have done for a variety of reasons. He added that some of them are just maintenance type projects, or good repair projects; a lot of them are the fixing capacity constraint issues, those types of projects; new access points; river crossings, etc.

Grasser asked, as you mentioned that updates were coming in as of Monday, could you just describe the nature of what those projects encompass. Haugen referred to Page 20 and explained that, off the top of his head, lumped in with the 2018 City Sales Tax projects, he thinks that is where they are identifying cleaning up what projects are being done. He said that Mr. Kuharenko sent a list cleaning that up.

Grasser said that, looking at the map, on the East Grand Forks side does that Universe of Projects include all of the classified streets or is it only a part of the system. Haugen responded that the State of Good Repair is identifying the projects that they have identified a need for, improvements on the City network they aren't identifying the operation and maintenance type projects that would be done, just the ones that are minor rehab and above type of projects so most of their streets are not showing a need to do a significant type of project on them.

Grasser asked what the definition of maintenance is and what is the dividing line of when it might show up a map or it doesn't because it is 2018 now and by 2045 pretty much every street is going to need something done with it. Haugen responded that they haven't specifically defined what the difference is between maintenance versus what is not. He said that the primary difference is the depth of the mill and overlay that takes place. He added that East Grand Forks has fewer asphalt streets and they just recently did a mill and overlay on most of them.

Vein commented that, just as a point of interest, there was an article in the Herald this past weekend about the Legacy Funds, and sometime this year North Dakota will have \$6 billion dollars set aside in Legacy Funds that continues to grow, and there is a draft bill regarding using the interest earned off those monies to fund infrastructure projects across the State. He said that he looks at this as some of the, maybe supporting documentation that there are these kinds of needs to address for infrastructure, and there is different ways of funding that and one of those ways is 50 year loans at 1.5% interest, so they would be low interest, lengthy loans. He stated that that issue will probably to through the Legislature in North Dakota next year, so that might be something that could be helpful.

Haugen reported that the next thing we will talk about is where we are at with revenue forecasts. He explained that they have identified all of the different funding programs by name, and have identified, as you will see later, individual annual base year estimates. He said that the big thing is that, if you recall from our last meeting, we talked about a potential 30% cut on the North Dakota side on the State Highway System; the DOT has determined that they are going to take the time now and after the Legislative Session, and through the Legislative Session to fully vet this potential and work with all of the agencies that might be impacted by it; so for our purposes and the other two MPOs purposes we aren't going to assume any change in the regional funding program in North Dakota for the life of this plan, so that was a major decision.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

Haugen commented that, just to give you some idea of how they tied these into time bands; there is a short time band (2023-2028), a mid-time band (2029-2037), and a long-term time band (2038-2045); so they are trying to identify when the project should be done. He explained how they came up with the time bands.

Haugen referred to a table listing the federal funds distributed by State DOTs and went over it briefly explaining that they worked with the various agencies to try to identify what our annual estimates and base years are, and you will see those with each of the individual programs. He went over the information briefly.

Haugen summarized stating that the total of all the revenue is \$533 million versus \$900 million in projects, but they aren't accounting for or including any potential revenue from national competitive awards like the Build Program or the State of Minnesota competitive awards like the Corridors of Commerce or other competitive funding sources.

Haugen commented that they are also acknowledging that the NDDOT is working on how the potential for Fargo/Moorhead becoming a TMA and that 30% cut; once they make their decision we may have to revisit our financial plan because the funding distribution would change. He added that FAST is only authorized through 2020 so if Congress adopts a new bill we will have to react to that as well; and then if the Legislatures add funding to the transportation pot we will have to react to that as well.

Haugen stated that our financial plan for this Long Range Transportation Plan is as good as it can be and is likely going to have to be revisited in the near future, maybe two years out or so; and we hope we have to revisit it because some of these things will be very positive.

Haugen said that we will now move on to the river crossing analysis. He stated that Kimley-Horn is on schedule and they will be submitting some draft documents on the level of service analysis at all the key intersections that we identified.

Haugen commented that one thing he did have in the packet that he wanted to include for today's discussion is that when we talk about additional river crossings we can't forget that in the Universe List of Projects we do have some maintenance identified for the three existing projects and what those values are estimated to be, so we can't forget that we have to keep the three that we have going.

Haugen stated that the last bullet; everyone should have received notice that next Wednesday at 3:30 p.m. we will be holding a discussion about; if 47th Avenue is going to be pursued further we need to figure out how the Minnesota process can be used to identify who the project sponsor will be, what steps processes that have to be done with that, so as we did in the scope of work we identified and had that separate meeting just to talk about the uniqueness on the Minnesota side of the 47th Avenue Bridge location.

Strandell commented that after this meeting he would like to take anyone that can make it out there to show where 47th would come across, there are some real issues out there, some really expensive issues out there on the Minnesota side of the river.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

Haugen said that in July we will vet the additional river analysis through the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Executive Policy Board and then we will set up the public open house specifically for that additional work and receive feedback from the public. He stated that we will also have some special Technical Advisory Committee meetings in July as well, and in August we are scheduled to begin drafting the preliminary recommended plan of what projects are fit financially constrained within the planning document.

Grasser asked if he could get a breakdown of the \$217 million that is coming off the City match, plus. Haugen referred to a slide and explained that there are three basic things that are compounded, growing at 2% per year, going out to 2037 for some. Grasser commented that a lot of those dollars are actually being used within operation and maintenance like transfers to the Street Department and whatnot so are we capturing 100% of our operating costs in that number; are these going to give us a skewed view as to what we can apply to actual causes. Haugen responded they break out, for operations, 4.7 million of that revenue; so roughly half of it is being taken out for your inner-departmental transfers and consultants. He explained that Ms. Stastad, Finance Director, gave them the data. He added that they are assuming that your cash carryover will be spent down, as you currently have a huge cash carryover, so they are assuming \$0 dollars for cash carryover starting in 2023; interest being earned on that cash carryover is \$0 dollars, so most of the revenue will be coming from sales tax that is coming in and the gas tax the State shares with you. Grasser said that he is just questioning about the consistency of how we see the numbers. He explained that the County match at \$0.8 million dollars, we must have an awful lot more operating dollars in Grand Forks County and Polk County and whatnot than that over a period, so if we are capturing those costs for Grand Forks but not with the other entities are we getting kind an apples to apples comparison. Haugen responded that they are just showing what is being captured in the study area, not all of Grand Forks or Polk Counties, so it is a very small amount that they are actually spending in our study area, unfortunately. Grasser stated that if we could get a more detailed breakdown he would appreciate it.

Vein asked who would be running the meeting scheduled for next Wednesday on 47th Avenue. Haugen responded that he would be running it, with Mr. Bourdon as our lead consultant going over materials. He added that it will be an informational meeting, it is not meant to have any action taken, just to lay out the uniqueness of that 47th Avenue location on the Minnesota side, because it is quite different than the four sites. Vein asked if they would be looking at who the local sponsor would be, not necessarily the complications with it but who would lead from the Minnesota side. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that for someone to become the lead however they need to know the complications that come with it. Vein said, though, that he would think that most of those on the Minnesota side, whether it is the City, the County, or the Township, are somewhat familiar with those complications. Strandell responded that they are somewhat familiar with them. Haugen added that there are various levels of familiarity with those complications, so they will try to give everybody the same foundation of knowledge so they can move forward with the same baseline.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

b. Bill Listing For The 5/12/18 to 6/15/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the May 12, 2018 to June 15, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

c. North Dakota Draft S.T.I.P. Released

Haugen reported that North Dakota did release its Draft S.T.I.P., which is the next four years of programming. He stated that certainly by our September meeting we will be presenting to you our Draft T.I.P. documents now that we are aware of what North Dakota has indicated they are programming for funding, and we already have the Minnesota Draft so we will have to get this through by the end of September. He added that those documents are now out for public review.

d. Point Bridge History

Powers shared a bit of history on the construction of the Point Bridge.

e. Possible Office Space

Vein reported that he knows that all of us have had some communication on the MPO office space and location. He said that there is no request being made of the MPO at this point in time, but he thought he would make sure that we are available, or if there are any comments you might have, to come back and be open and hopefully transparent about what is going on.

Vein explained that a little bit of the rationale for why this office space is being looked at is just that the Grand Forks Herald is moving out of their downtown building; they are consolidating in the WDAZ building on Washington Street, and a few of us have been through the building and it is being underutilized today and the potential purchasers have approached the City about a possible need or willingness to relocate and or utilize that building for City staff. He added that the Economic Development Corporation is currently utilizing the lower level and we have been looking at other options for what other departments might move there, so internally they have looked at Community Development and Planning that is currently in the Grand Forks City Hall, that may be combined there; and the other might be to have the MPO and the Economic Development Corporation utilize some space as well.

Vein commented that the back area, which had been an open gathering area would be something that would serve as multipurpose and multiuse conference rooms for those potential organizations that may be located there.

Vein stated that it is not established if anyone is going to move, or if we are going to do this, but it is in the study phase to see what the potential might be and what departments might be interested in moving in there and how we would consolidate that and thus open up some area in City hall for some level of expansion, including Engineering. He added that it isn't as coordinated as we would like because it is nice to have everybody in one building, but if we do expand outside City Hall that might be an opportunity.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 20th, 2018**

Haugen reported that he believes that we will have the Finance Committee of the MPO meet as there will be a proposal submitted to us for consideration of the space that could be provided to us and how it might be configured and what the estimated cost per square foot for the space might be, so sometime later in July he would expect the Finance Committee would review the information and forward a recommendation to the full board in August. He added if it is decided that this would work they would be looking for a five-year commitment on the space, and we are currently on a year-to-year lease agreement with both City Halls.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 20TH, 2018,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:50 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager