

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

**Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the July 18<sup>th</sup>, 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, Mike Powers, and Al Grasser.

Absent were: Marc DeMers and Jeannie Mock.

Guest(s): David Kuharneko, Grand Forks Engineering; Meredith Richards, Grand Forks Community Development; and James Kiedrowski, KLJ Engineering Group.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER TO APPROVE THE JUNE 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

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

Haugen reported that they did advertise that today was the time and date for a public hearing.

Vein opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Vein closed the public hearing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen explained that this T.I.P. amendment involves two things; the first is our standard changing of funding, the T.I.P. listing itself, and the second is our first requirement to insert performance measures into our T.I.P. document.

Haugen said that the first item is that East Grand Forks, every fourth year, gets the City Subtarget from the Northwest Minnesota area and in 2018 they had decided to spend those funds on six different projects, most of them dealing with bike/ped improvements throughout the City. He stated that that was all set to go, and then Minnesota received a notice that there was some unused SAFETEA-LU Safe Route to School Program funds available, and asked if there were any projects that might be able to utilize those funds. He added that they were told that if they were able to use them they would need to do so this construction season; so the East Grand Forks projects were identified as potential projects for that.

Haugen commented that just Monday, Minnesota was informed that they were awarding more Federal funds, and changing them to the Safe Routes to School program funding source, and included in front of you is a printout of what they know the amendment actually is; and the award is for all but one project in East Grand Forks receiving SAFETEA-LU funds. He added that at one time they were only identifying four of the six projects, but now they are awarding SAFETEA-LU funds for five of the six, and the only project that is not getting funds is the mill and overlay that is taking place at the East Grand Forks end of the Point Bridge, as there was no Bike/Ped portion to that so they did not award any Safe Routes to School money to that project.

Haugen stated that with the award of all those projects, that means that East Grand Forks locally will receive \$165,000 more dollars in Federal funds towards the projects this year. He said that what it means to Northwest Minnesota is that we are receiving a \$1,025,000 dollars in Federal funds to be spent in Northwest Minnesota this year. He added that the \$860,000 that the City was going to use of the Subtarget, that is being redistributed to the Counties in our Northwest area. He said that they typically under program their 80/20 match for their projects, so, again the funds had to be spent in a hurry and the County program typically has projects that are at 65/35, and so they are awarding more of the Federal funds to the County programs.

Haugen commented that, highlighted in yellow and red are the new funding sources for the projects, and the new dollar amounts, and that is what we are amending in the T.I.P. today.

Haugen stated that the second part of the amendment is to insert text into our T.I.P. document, again under the requirements of performance based planning we are required to include a write-up in our T.I.P. document on how we are addressing performance, and how it is being incorporated into a programming process. He said that right now the only measures and targets that we have adopted, that we have to address in this, are the safety ones so you will see the write ups is only addressing the safety performance measures.

Haugen reported that last month we did a very simple regular T.I.P. amendment, but from now on we will have to do these types of T.I.P. amendments, where we are changing listings and tables, and then we will also have to update this written part of the document as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that we did advertise for the public to come and present in person today, and we also advertised that they could provide written comments up until 11:00 a.m. this morning; no comments were received. He said that last week the Technical Advisory Committee did recommend adoption of this amendment, contingent on the Federal Award, and Monday we did hear how the Federal Award will be done, so your action today does not need to include the contingency clause.

Vein asked if there was a local match for these monies. Haugen responded that there is local match. He explained that East Grand Forks is using monies from their State Aid account as match for these funds. He added that if they had been awarded the Safe Routes to School funds they already had the Federal Subtarget in hand, so they are actually reducing the local match by that \$165,000.

Grasser commented that you have over a million dollars worth of work for East Grand Forks, will they be able to get that work done this year, is there still a stipulation that the work has to be done. Haugen responded that it has been bid and it was awarded funding. Grasser said, then that these are only amendment, adding that he thought they were having to start from scratch.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2018 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers and Mock.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR MINNESOTA 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY**

Viafara reported that you did receive an edited version of the Scope of Work for the Minnesota 220 North Corridor Study. He stated that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting there were some issues brought to our attention in terms of spelling or editing; and those changes were made to the document that is now before you for your consideration.

Viafara said that we are here requesting your approval for this Request for Proposals to advance this corridor study. He added that the corridor study encompasses the roads of Minnesota 220 from 9<sup>th</sup> to County Road 140 in the north part of the city. He commented that it is very important to bring to your attention one of the objectives of this study which is to find out new transportation and traffic conditions that will happen in developments that are now occurring or are expected to occur in the northern part of the city.

Viafara stated that is basically the purpose of this particular study. He added that it will also address some issues with safety at the intersection of Minnesota 220 North and Highway 2; so this is basically the overall proposal and the objectives are clearly stated and the Scope of Work is discussed and the draft RFP has been given to you so the MPO is seeking your approval to advance this corridor study.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR MINNESOTA 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY, AS PRESENTED.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: DeMers and Mock.*

Haugen commented that, just to give you a recap, originally in our Work Program this was going to be a study of the Washington Street Underpass, but the NDDOT is doing that with their project development of the replacement of the Underpass, so MnDOT approached us to do this study and they are agreeing to pay the 20% match for it.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN STUDY**

Haugen reported that last month we amended our Work Program to add this activity in, and if will recall we decided to have the study started at the same time, or in the same year that we are going to do an intersection study of U.S. #2 and North Washington in Grand Forks. He stated that we are just now starting on the Downtown Transportation Planning end of it.

Haugen pointed out that included in the packet was the original Scope of Work that was distributed at the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting last week. He stated that there were several changes requested be done to the Scope of Work, and he did highlight them in the document.

Haugen said that the first amendment, trying to schedule the transportation side with the work that the Downtown Action Plan is doing, some of the dates were moved up for the submittal of the Draft Report. He explained that another reason for moving the dates up was because of a recommendation to delete the #4 activity in the Scope of Work, so by freeing up that work the belief was that the time could be compressed as well. He stated that the last amendment was the original consultant cost budgeted for the study was \$110,000, so by taking out the #4 activity we were able to reduce the budget to \$50,000-\$60,000. He explained that the \$50,000 is there if we'd kept the original timeline, the \$60,000 is what is being budgeted with the new timeline in place.

Haugen stated that if you approve the dates for deliverables, then \$60,000 would be the budget. He added that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting; and Meredith Richards is here from the Grand Forks Community Development Department, there was a question on the timing of things, and Ms. Richards did follow up with their Downtown Action Plan and he thinks they prefer the earlier time, in order to maintain momentum, as being amended into this scope; so \$60,000 with February and March as the completion time and just doing activities 1, 2, and 3 in the scope. He said that #4 was discussed to be done a year or two from now after the action plan has been completed and some of the river crossing traffic impacts are not apparent any more.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein asked if Ms. Richards had anything to add to this. Richards responded that she was only here to answer any question the board may have. She added, though, that as Mr. Haugen said their consultant's response to the changing scope was, yes, moving the timeline up would be helpful and that item #4 that was recommended for elimination last time certainly could be kind of a recommendation of the Downtown Planning Processes, that should be an implementation recommendation to do that study in the future after the Downtown Plan is completed.

Vein asked for more clarification on Item #4. Richards responded that she really isn't the one to explain this as it is kind of outside her comfort zone. Vein asked if Mr. Grasser could offer any clarification on this item. Grasser responded saying first that he has a couple of concerns. He said that Mr. Haugen mentioned that the City has a Downtown study going on with a consultant and that they are trying to marry that up with the MPO work; but it seems like the full scope of work is going to take too long to really go back and incorporate it into the City process. He added that another issue, as he understands, is that the Downtown Study that they are looking to implement is really probably a 5 to 10 year project, so what are the implementation things they are going to do in the short-term; and a lot of the items in Item 4 seemed to be more long-term type things, where they talk about DeMers Avenue as a two lane street, with left turns lanes will not meet the future forecasted volumes. He said that we certainly want to consider that as a long-term issue, not something in the next 5 to 10 years; he thinks that we all hope we that we aren't reconstructing a street that's been designed in the short term, so he thinks between those and the fact that the Kennedy project is still disrupting traffic, and going back to logistics of getting traffic counts and things like that it seemed like that was an item that was best put off for a later date.

Vein commented what he was alluding to, or thinking was that that will come back, maybe by expanding the scope of work at a later date, as that study is still needed, but not at this time. Grasser responded that he thinks the question probably depends on who you ask; the question he has is can you look at some of those items in there; the signal would be a downtown more appropriate thing to bring back when you can concentrate on the downtown, but some of those other items seem to be a little bit broader and might fit into the Long Range Transportation Plan Update or something, because it seems that the impacts of smart vehicles and autonomous vehicles is something that would be an issue beyond the downtown. Powers asked if they are saying that it is going to come back eventually; he is just curious because he thinks traffic down there is just a nightmare. Vein added that it is bad on DeMers, going through the downtown, most specifically.

Vein said that he just brought that up because he thinks it needs to be done, but it is a matter of the timing of when we do. He added that he thinks that because of the study that is going on now, it is best to leave it off, but he isn't sure how long we leave it off before it comes back again; but just to keep this process going we probably go ahead and approve the RFP without #4 and then bring it back at a later time, when it is most appropriate. Powers said, then, that we want to approve #1, #2, and #3, and leave #4 for a later date. Vein responded that that is what he thinks the Technical Advisory Committee and the City has requested we do in conjunction with the other study that is being done, but he just doesn't want to leave it off too long.

Haugen referred to the staff report and stated that Item #1 is the Parking Study. He said that the last Parking Study was done in 2011, and we will be updating that; primarily just from the parking demand

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

analysis and then, as he understands, with the Downtown Action Plan some redevelopment proposals will be considered, and what those redevelopment proposals might have on the current existing parking demand, and how new development occurs, how should parking demand be met.

Haugen said that Item #2 addresses the one-way pair on North 3<sup>rd</sup> & 4<sup>th</sup> Streets from Grand Forks Downtown northward, will be looking at alternatives of how those could be better used with the concrete that is there, and two lanes in each direction, there may be the opportunity to squeeze more use out of them than how they are currently being used. He added that there is also an issue in front of North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street bar scene, especially at closing time, to try to help alleviate those congestion problems. He stated that the other issue is the Water Treatment Plant on the southend of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, redevelopment, and determining if there is even a need for 3<sup>rd</sup> Street to exist all the way to Minnesota Avenue.

Haugen stated that Item #3 is about trying to make connection between the Downtown and UND, so we will be looking at the University Avenue corridor to see how that could be developed more strongly to show that it is the main connection between the Downtown and UND.

Haugen commented that there is the Columbia Coulee Initiative on UND campus, and this Downtown Action Plan will address some of the similar design concepts for the downtown, which includes University Avenue and the Downtown area, so this study we will see how we can link those two concepts together on the University Avenue Corridor.

Vein asked how does the coordination with the consultant doing the Downtown Action Plan, and also the coordination between the MPO and the City, will have to gel somehow to move this forward. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained that there is a Steering Committee for the Downtown Action Plan; and there will need to be a similar steering type committee, and we will try to meld as many members from one end to the other, and we will invite some from the technical side of transportation, so there will be some cross-pollination of people wearing two hats on the same planning efforts. Vein asked if the timelines should meld pretty well as we are planning both of them correct. Haugen responded they should. Richards commented that she thinks there will be some verbiage either added to the RFP or once a consultant is selected that, as much as possible, the public engagement pieces would be joint; we could have a public meeting that can serve both the MPO's study and the Downtown Action Plan Study, much like the cross-pollination with the Steering Committee, get the same on public input.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: DeMers and Mock.***

**MATTER OF 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT UPDATE**

a. Universe Of Projects

Haugen reported that we are very close to completion on the Universe of Projects. He said that by the end of today the NDDOT District said that they would be providing their finalized list of projects. He commented that from that list they were able to ensure that they were including all of the projects that are being contemplated. He added that they did ask Grand Forks City Staff to take a look at some of the projects they identified to see which will be programmed in the next two years of the CIP document so that we can get them off of our list of projects to consider for the Long Range Plan.

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

Presentation ensued.

Haugen commented that, as you can see, they are still working on the five river crossings, and finalizing those costs. He said they hope to be done by the end of the week.

Haugen stated that on the Main Street Program project cost, he probably need to chat with the City about how we are going to convert some of those utility relocates that are ineligible into eligible projects for this program.

Haugen referred to a slide with the Range of Alternatives and commented that it just a recap of where we are at with different dollar amounts that are going to the different ways of how we identify what projects funding might be coming from.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee is holding a special meeting on Friday, July 27<sup>th</sup> to start narrowing down the Universe List of Projects, and the projects that are meeting the fiscal constraint issue, and also meeting some of our issues as far as capacity constraint and other items.

b. Financial Plan Draft

Haugen stated that they did have to make a major correction to the Grand Forks local funds as we had a formula that was doubling up the amount of funding. He said that they were previously looking at \$217 million being available, but that dropped down to \$126 million.

Haugen pointed out that these tables are now showing what is available in revenue during that short time-frame of the Long Range Transportation Plan, the Mid-Term and the Long-Term. He commented that, for example, on the North Dakota side for the Highway Safety Improvement Program there is \$3 million being forecasted as being available for the first five years, then \$7 million for the next eight years, and \$7 million for the last seven years. He said that on the Minnesota side the total amount is \$443 million of revenue. He added that if you look back at the expenses of the Universe List of Projects we are close to \$900 million, so we are short financially.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that, as they were told, NDDOT is not going to change their Urban Regional Program; they will wait to see the results of the 2020 census and determine whether or not Fargo/Moorhead Metro Area becomes a Transportation Management Area, which would change the funding distribution across North Dakota. He said that we may also have to revisit this after the FAST ACT expires, so the message on this side is that there is likely a good chance that we will have to revisit this Street and Highway portion of our Long Range Transportation Plan sooner than our regular five year cycle because the finances may change.

Haugen said that, getting back to performance measures, we have addressed the Safety Performance Target by the deadline. He added that our next deadlines are to address the Pavement and Bridge Performance Measures, and also the Travel Time Reliability Measure.

Haugen commented that, just to recap, we can adopt our own local targets for those issues, or we can adopt the State Targets. He added that if we adopt local ones we only need one target for the local area, which we did for the Safety Performance Measures; if we adopt both State levels, then we are adopting two sets of targets, one for each side of the river.

Haugen referred to a slide and pointed out that these are the targets that are being set for Pavement. He said that what they are finding out is that the newness of the Federal Measures, we don't have a good data set to actually have an apples to apples data set of the Minnesota side and the North Dakota side, so we're most likely going to be recommending next month that the MPO just adopt the State Targets when it comes to the Pavement and Bridge Condition Targets. He said that in the packet you will see that.

Haugen said that the next performance measures then would be the Travel Time Reliability. He stated that the States had adopted those performance measures with not as great of data as we will have access to when we have to consider our performance measures for those items. He commented that there was a conversion of contractor at the federal level that is creating this difference in data, but the deadline didn't change so they had to go with what was available. He said that our deadline is 180 days after theirs, and that 180 days the contractor is assembling improved data sets for us to consider our targets, so we are still working through those issues of travel reliability measures.

c. River Crossing Analysis

Haugen reported that, again we are now looking at five crossings, with 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue being added and the adjustment of 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue to actually be mentioned as Elks Drive. He said that we are doing these as two-lane connections to the first north/south roadways on each side.

Haugen commented that we have done some preliminary analysis of all of the intersections at the bridge ends, so in the past you saw some level of service analysis at key intersections, now for each river crossing we should have a level analysis of the intersection closest to where the bridge would be intersecting the two sides. He referred to tables included in the presentation, and stated that they show us this information.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that they are still reporting the same results; the further north you are the more it improves the performance in the Point Bridge corridors; the further south you are the less it has on local traffic, the more it has on regional traffic. He added that there are some little subtle differences between how Gateway Drive and the Kennedy Bridge is improved with these scenarios. He said that in looking at the corridor on the North Dakota side, if we were to add those traffic in 2045, these are the type of volumes that will be progressing through that corridor. He stated that there was some early high level look at what type of geometry or widening might be necessary along those corridors.

Haugen referred to a Level of Service map and commented that it shows all those detailed level of services. He said that we do have a few intersections that, without any mitigation, if we popped a bridge in we would have some issues so we are identifying what potential new traffic control could be at those intersections to improve operations. He stated that they are pretty confident that the continuous flow intersection that has been studied in the past for DeMers and Washington will perform well. He said that something that popped up is South Washington and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, regardless of whether we have an additional river crossing or not, we are forecasting that to have traffic issues without a bridge, if we add a bridge at that location we would have to take a look at some geometric changes or some other traffic control changes at that intersection.

Haugen said that the next maps just give us a sense of how we are showing the alignment for each of the river crossings. He went over them briefly.

Haugen stated that some of you were at a meeting we held at the end of June to talk about some of the jurisdictional issues with 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He referred to a map and explained that it is trying to represent those issues; adding that they haven't modified it yet to reflect the discussion that occurred. He pointed out that the county system exists out here today, the City system extends out to here, today, and the discussion is that the City system would extend out to the dike. He added that if we were going to do a 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge we will have to find somebody instead of the Township that is owner of the roads to make the connections. He said that with those proper connections, it sounded to him from our meeting that the County, either as a state aid highway or just as a county road, would most likely be the sponsor to make a connection to a bridge at 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Grasser asked if they would stay rural sections or not. Haugen responded that most likely they would. Haugen pointed out that Rhinehart extended down is paved currently, but he doesn't believe it is paved to any design standards of substance. He explained that the neighbors got together and built a hard surface road.

Haugen said that that is basically where we are at with this study. He added that by the end of July we will have had our Special Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and will hopefully have narrowed down that year of Universe List of Projects to more match our forecasted revenue that is available by timeband, and we will have more of the final draft results of the river analysis, a refined cost estimate, and some of those other things that we will then start distributing and having meetings with other individual bodies like we did in the past, but also some public meetings or neighborhood meetings to discuss these river crossings.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that just to remind you, our goal is by October to have a draft document available for review, and then we will go through each individual City and County Board to get preliminary and final approval so that by our December meeting we will be in line to be able to adopt a plan that meets our five-year annual update.

Vein asked which agencies would be involved in the approval process, wouldn't it just be the two City Councils, not that counties. Haugen responded that although we have not done this in the past, however we've gotten into some issues this time around where we probably need some official action on the County ends, particularly when it comes to whether 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue will be carried forward as a site or note, whether they'll maintain Merrifield or not. He added that we are also including, in the revenue side, some of the County funding programs and are also identifying the County Highways that are in the MPO study area and when they are scheduled for improvements and use of federal funds, so that is something in the past we haven't done, something that now we will be going forward with to get their concurrence.

Vein said, again, we take final action but does each City Council have to take action as well. Haugen responded that our request to all of our Member Jurisdictions will be to consider adopting the Transportation Plan as part of their local comprehensive plan. He said that we give them 60-days to take action on that request, and to give us feedback; but yes, at the end of that 60-day period this body, with the input you receive from the individual jurisdictions action, plus the public's action, plus the Technical Advisory Committees recommendation, will be to adopt a plan. He added that you see that there can be five different versions of it out there floating around, but the MPOs is the one that is the basis for the programming of federal funds or federal action on any projects. Vein said that theoretically we could have four different recommendations, and then we have the final say as to what goes into the actual document. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Grasser said that something he never thought of before, but it is coming up; he is looking at this particular drawing, and he is kind of assuming that we are going to get little or no state monies on the North Dakota side, but there will probably be some significant state dollars on the Minnesota side; but looking at that, and looking at where the bridge is and if you look from the centerline to the river, there is very little on the North Dakota side but a whole lot on the Minnesota side, do we have any idea how the different states would look at participation, would they look at the bridge as a whole or would they look at the part that is within the particular states boundary, as some of them he has noticed are skewed quite a bit one way or the other, so the dollar amounts may, as it gets received at a local and state level vary quite a bit. Haugen responded that there probably isn't an answer until you actually get into the final, or more detailed planning involvement. He said it depends on how much that bridge spans over the river.

Haugen cited an example bridge and explained how the funding process would work.

Information only.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, July 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

**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 6/16/18 to 7/13/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the June 16, 2018 to July 13, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE JULY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:55 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager