

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, November 21st, 2018 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the November 21st, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

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

Absent were: Marc DeMers and Jeannie Mock.

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

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Vein declared a quorum was present.

PRESENTATION OF LETTER OF APPRECIATION AND PLAQUE TO GARY MALM

Vein reported that today is Gary Malm's last day on the MPO Executive Policy Board. He read and presented a copy of a letter of appreciation and a plaque for his service and dedication to the GF-EGF MPO to Mr. Malm, and wished him well in future endeavors.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE OCTOBER 17TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 17TH, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2019-2020 UPWP AND EXECUTION OF CONTRACT WITH NDDOT

Haugen reported that every two years we initiate a new two-year work program, and with that is a required contract that we execute with our Lead State Agency, the NDDOT. He said that included in the packet was a Draft 2019-2020 Work Program showing what activities the MPO will undertake in that two-year period.

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

Haugen commented that we are required to show, in order to get the financial aid, that we are fulfilling our requirement to maintain our planning documents; and any additional studies that we need to do in order to maintain proper planning and programming.

Haugen stated that he is going to start at the back of the document and talk about our finances first. He explained that we annually receive about \$500,000 of Federal Planning dollars; those need to have a local match to them, so our total budget shouldn't be less than just over \$630,000.

Haugen pointed out that, as you already know, and as the agenda identifies, we have already started some studies that we said that we would carry over into next year, so you will see that we have monies from the previous year carrying over in the amount of \$160,000 federal funds. He said that we have also recently seen some additional dollars for some of the studies that we have been undertaking that are on State Highways, so our budget for 2019 is just shy of \$850,000.

Haugen stated that in 2020 we are not identifying carrying over any projects, so we don't have any carry over funds shown, therefore we are just basically showing our annual federal apportionment and the match required for that, so our budget is minus about \$200,000 from the previous year.

Haugen reported that with those financial things in mind; and working with our local and State partners on identifying what activities to do and when to do them; we have proposed what is shown in the spreadsheet that summarizes all of the activities. He added that the top half of the spreadsheet is what is needed to basically keep the MPO office open and the bottom half is where we identify more of our specific studies that we are either required or are asked to accomplish.

Haugen referred to the spreadsheet, the Transportation Plan Update, and explained that we are finishing up our major update on a five-year cycle, so our investment next year is not anywhere near where it has been the last couple of years, but there is still an investment for those things we do have to do, including updating our Regional Architecture for the ITS System, which is on a regular five-year cycle; and we also identified that there are still some performance measures that we have to keep track of and annually either back our own performance measures or consider both State performance measures, so there is still some activities that we have to do for that.

Haugen stated that you will also notice that with A.T.A.C. we have to maintain our annual membership fee, but we aren't anticipating having A.T.A.C. do any additional work at this time for our Transportation Plan.

Haugen said that by reducing our Transportation Plan requirements and funding that will free up some dollars to do additional studies that we normally wouldn't be doing on a regular basis, that aren't necessarily required by our State or Federal Partners. He stated that in the Corridor Planning line is where we placed the bulk of those excess funds and identified projects that have come to our attention; and the first two items are the carry-over projects that we have already initiated, the Skewed Intersection Study, the Grand Forks Downtown Parking Study, and the Mn220 North Corridor Study. He added that the A.T.A.C. traffic count is a continuation of our video counting program that we have in Grand Forks, and we are examining what it will take to expand that to the East Grand Forks side with this year's work so next year we may be able to implement video counting in East Grand Forks.

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

Haugen reported that the new project is one that was discussed a lot last year but was delayed because of timing reasons and that is the Downtown Transportation Plan. He said that since then the work program has expanded it. He explained that a year ago it was conceived as sort of a Grand Forks focused transportation plan but since then East Grand Forks, through their Greater Minnesota Mobility Plan, has identified that DeMers Avenue on the east side has some reliability issues as well, and they have set aside some special funding to address those issues; so by doing this plan and expanding it to the Minnesota side we are able to show our solutions to the liability problems that have been identified and can seek additional funding for it. He said that on the Grand Forks side it is still basically determining if or how the redevelopment that is coming through the Downtown Action Plan will impact our existing transportation system. He added that we do know that DeMers itself is scheduled for reconstruction, it is basically reconstructing a lot of the same capacity that we currently see there today, and we do know that our future forecasts show that today's capacity isn't going to meet the future demand for that so we need to also start looking at ways to relieve traffic off of DeMers either with more emphasis on side streets or changing modes across the river in particular.

Haugen commented that the work activity to initiate the Downtown Transportation Plan includes a scope-of-work that starts with a large range of possibilities; and then as we get into the specific RFP process and define what the actual scope-of-work will be in the RFP we can narrow it down to more specific actions.

Haugen stated that the other major item not traditionally identified is Cities Area Transit. He explained that, if you have seen some of the media lately you know they are working with UND on the possibility of UND dropping its separate shuttle service and Cities Area Transit assuming it service instead. He said that we will do a study in 2019 to make sure that all of the financials are to everyone's satisfaction and also make sure that there is capital available for three additional buses; and then in 2020 we would carry it over, if the UND shuttle becomes CAT operations, and we would then look at potential route changes if required.

Vein asked, concerning the transit changes with UND, when is it projected that our system would take over those bus routes. Haugen responded that the hope is that it would occur by the middle of August; Cities Area Transit would be in place then and all set up to operate the UND shuttle service. Vein said, then, that we would be doing the study between now and then because we would need to purchase three additional buses and it has to make sense financially that we do that or have some level of reimbursement, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that that is what that study will look at, primarily the financial resources that are needed and how they can be achieved in order for assumption of the service by Cities Area Transit by say August 15th. He said that there has already been a lot of pre-work done between City Staff and UND Staff, and so there is a lot of knowledge base there, but there is still some work needed on the details that this study will cover, and make sure everyone understands what the real costs will be for each entity involved. Vein asked who will make the final decision, who will say yes or no to this. Haugen responded that it is a partnership between the two Cities, the MPO and UND; although the two major players will be the City and UND. Vein asked if the MPO Executive Board has the final say in the decision. Haugen responded that the Board will have to ensure that it is not going to harm the rest of the system, nor shift federal resources over to a service that could be viewed as a closed service, serving UND students instead of the public at large, so that is what our primary concern would be.

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

Powers asked if there would be any chance that Cities Area Transit would be able to utilize any of UND's equipment and buses. Haugen responded that it wouldn't be possible due to the fact that the UND vehicles are State Vehicles so there would be too many logistic hurdles to get over between State Fleet and City use; but maybe the bigger issue would be that the ADA requirements are drastically different between what the State Fleet can operate versus what Cities Area Transit can operate on the road, which is the reason why at least three coaches would need to be purchased in order for this transition to occur.

Vein referred to the Corridor Planning line item and pointed out that we have the Downtown Parking Plan and the Downtown Transportation Plan. He asked if the Downtown Parking Plan is taking place now. Haugen responded it is currently underway now. Vein said so it was obviously split out to look at parking separate, and that is just for Grand Forks Downtown not East Grand Forks Downtown, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Vein asked, with the Downtown Transportation Plan there were some concerns with being able to get accurate traffic counts, that it would be difficult to do that when the bridges are under construction and also when when DeMers is under construction as well, so how are we going to handle getting that information when we are trying to do a plan while it is under construction. Haugen responded that our expectation is that the Kennedy Bridge traffic will be back to normal flow sometime before the DeMers reconstruction starts, so we have DeMers Avenue and 5th Street, because of our counting program we have been counting traffic 24/7 for a couple of years now so we have a lot of the traffic data already in our books for the main corridors. He stated that for the side corridors, just as we did this spring, we can typically go in and do a quick manual turning movement count with temporary staff for the minor intersections in and around DeMers, to the north and south, and we do that during a week timeframe, three intersections a day three days in a row during that window of time before the DeMers reconstruction impacts traffic hard in the downtown. Vein commented, though, that since the Kennedy Bridge has been under construction for an extended period of time it still affects the counts that were taken downtown, so we will never really know until they are both done and you have free flowing traffic, so are we able to make some level of correction or adjustment based on that. Haugen responded that for the reconstruction project itself there is a traffic operations study that was done by the DOT, in which they captured a lot of the traffic data and made their design decisions based on that operational study, so we have that as well as a barometer, or a normalizer to what data we are seeing from the automatic video capture and also from manual counts we can do.

Vein stated that his last question is would it be possible to get some level of description of what that study would look like, maybe being more specific to Grand Forks than East Grand Forks, because they are both doing studies of their downtowns, but there may be somewhat different issues with East Grand Forks for DeMers Avenue, but the larger project he is assuming is going to be all of the downtown and adjacent areas on the Grand Forks side. He asked how far south that study will go, will it go all the way down to Minnesota on the North Dakota side and how far north will it go. Haugen responded that the basic parameters envisioned are University Avenue on the north, the DeMers overpass on the west, and originally we weren't envisioning going past 1st Avenue/Kittson. Vein commented that there is some discussion about the redevelopment of the Water Treatment Plan down at Minnesota, and what those

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

implications could be, would that not be a part of this. Haugen responded that it certainly can be, but from what he has seen from the Downtown Action Plan redevelopment of the Water Treatment Plant is proposed to be row houses and an apartment complex, and in and of themselves they wouldn't generate the same type of traffic as say if an event center were placed there or a major commercial/retail building, so the impact would be different than the treatment plant, but would it be more he isn't so sure. He stated that the thinking was that the primary corridors, DeMers and the immediate side streets would be included. Vein commented that he thinks the intent of this presentation probably wasn't to get into that detail, but to identify the costs in the work plan for what is coming forward, so we can have more discussion on that in the future. Haugen added that it sets us up for that refinement down the road. Grasser added that, again, on the downtown we may have other disruptions on the side streets; such as with 4th with the construction there and how that street sometimes closes completely and sometimes has a partial opening, and there is still anticipation that something else will happen with Hugo's and stuff downtown so there may be some traffic challenges relative to traffic counts, but the fact that we have historical data will probably get us through most of that.

Grasser said that the follow-up question on the downtown is that there is reference to the Minnesota Mobility Plan; does the Minnesota Mobility Plan show up in this work program, or was it previously programmed. Haugen responded that that is a statewide mobility plan that MnDOT developed and did, and we reviewed and provided comments on it, but there isn't really any work on our end to do a mobility plan, we can take information from that mobility plan which shows liability issues on DeMers Avenue and take it to the next level of studies to come up with what are the real issues and what are the possible solutions; and what are the cost estimates.

Grasser asked if that will all come out of the Grand Forks side of the Downtown Plan. Haugen responded that this work activity expanded from it just being a Downtown Grand Forks plan to, because DeMers Avenue is a connector between the two cities looking at the East Grand Forks DeMers Avenue corridor as well. Grasser said, though, that if we are looking at the East Side DeMers Avenue Corridor, are you saying it doesn't need to show up in the work plan. Haugen responded that it is in the description, that we are doing both downtowns. Grasser stated that it isn't clear to him whether those dollars were actually in there or if we were responding to the Minnesota request, what that request was. Haugen responded that the Minnesota request was, we are looking at downtown traffic in Grand Forks, to please extend it to include the issues on the Minnesota side that are on DeMers Avenue, and do it all at once.

Haugen commented that one of the limitations we have right now is traffic signal systems that really can't communicate and coordinate, so one of the outcomes might be to reach commonality on our signal system so that they can be uniformly coordinated.

Grasser stated that he sees that the scope of this is five to ten years, does that match; you mentioned that there are going to be downtown capacity issues, are those anticipated to happen in the five to ten-year timeframe or are we looking at two different things. Haugen responded that 2030 would be the arc, so that is the ten-year timeframe. He added that they will be including this in 2020 and ten years is 2030, so we are using that 2030 forecast as our base.

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

Vein asked if the one-way pairs are included in this too. Haugen responded they aren't part of this. He explained that ten years ago we did a study of the one-way pairs, that study is still relative, so he isn't sure that there is a need to update it as the traffic volume numbers aren't that different and they are fairly low compared to the rest of the street network. He added that it would be more of a need to work with the neighborhoods to see if they would be willing to revert them back to two-way streets, so it isn't currently envisioned as a work activity to do a traffic analysis of what converting them to two-way traffic would entail.

Grasser said that there was discussion in the Long Range Transportation Plan about trying to work out an agreement with BNSF as to the Bike/Ped Plan, is that still coming in the Long Range Transportation Plan, an actual agreement. Haugen responded that that is still a work in progress. He said that it won't be coming in as part of the adoption of the Long Range Transportation Plan, it will be coming as a separate, stand-alone issue that they are working on outside of the Long Range Transportation Plan. He added that it isn't listed as a specific item, it is under the transportation plan update and implementation, but we are going to have more than an implementation issue, and so we don't list all of the things that we do, or sort of follow up implementation of issues that are hanging out there, that is one of them.

Haugen continued, reporting that in 2020, the next detailed spreadsheet is, and as we have seen in our presentations of our current 2045 plan is that in 2020 we have to start the five-year cycle of updates and the first thing we work on are the Land Use Plans for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that you will see a significant shifting of funds away from transportation related activities and focusing them on the land use plans. He commented that both Cities' staff have indicated they view these land use plan updates as doing more simple updates and tweaks of their existing documents. He added that their 2045 plans were done with consultant services, with a scope of work that asked consultants to do a completely fresh look at land use planning in both communities, so this time around they aren't anticipating taking a ground zero point of view, but instead will work with what they have and do some updates and tweaks to it to make it better so we don't have as much money in it as we did when we did the 2045 Land Use Plan, but we will be doing some updating them in 2020 to reach the Year 2050.

Haugen stated that we identify that follow-up Cities Area Transit study, which is a route study, so it has a little more magnitude than the financial aspect of taking over the UND Shuttle service; it will include looking at routes in and around UND so it will take a little more effort and expertise so we added a few more dollars to it.

Haugen commented that this time in 2019 we will revisit the 2020 work program just to make sure there haven't been significant changes that require us to change this. He said that the one thing that comes to mind that could cause us to have to make changes to this plan would be action by both State Legislatures, or action by Congress.

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE 2019-2020 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM AND TO AUTHORIZE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT WITH NDDOT.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers and Mock.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF US 2/ US 81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY CONTRACT

Kouba reported that back in September we approved the release of an RFP for the US 2/US 81 Skewed Intersection Study and received two submittals. She said that interviews were held and the Selection Committee chose KLJ to do the study.

Kouba commented that some of the key issues with this intersection is that there is a very sharp skew onto Gateway, between Gateway and Washington. She added that there is also some major congestion, looking into the future, and that congestion is only increased because of the railway traffic that is going through there, and there is a possibility of unit trains. She said there is also multi-modal issues, there are sidewalks along Gateway, there is a bikepath that kind of takes a rear frontage to Gateway, and transit also does a loop around through these intersections to keep along with their various routes, plus they would be looking at some funding possibilities throughout this whole thing.

Kouba stated that previous concepts have been done in the past, of course; and various ideas have been presented from grade separations to rerouting and consolidating the intersections themselves, as well as some of the more simple idea of just letting people know when the train is actually there so they can reroute themselves.

Kouba reported that KLJ put together some; we'll be establishing the needs throughout this and will generate a memorandum with all of the general area, and they will be doing microsimulation along there, and a safety analysis as the crash reports might not say what is safe or not by saying there is no-one or saying there aren't any crashes there so it must safe, that isn't a very good answer.

Kouba said that basically, also understanding how traffic flows and impacts the network will be looked at and better routes will be looked at.

Kouba stated that we want to do some visioning as well with business in the area as well as the neighborhood. She said that from that they will be able to jump into some alternatives and analysis of those alternatives, including the cost of the alternatives and scoring of them as well.

Kouba commented that the final item for this project will be the actual draft of the corridor vision as well as ways of implementing everything from small, build it into a larger project, into larger projects that might be in the future.

Vein said that one of the questions he has has to do, and this kind of came up on Monday, with the public input process and the ability to respond during the study process and the recommendation period. He asked if there is a better way to do that process because we rely a lot on people showing up for meetings and get input from that and he has struggled a lot with getting the public to attend and they have tried to do it for a lot of different projects and people just don't show up but they still complain. He added that he is concerned in general, not only on this project but on others as well, if there is a

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

better way to get statistically valid feedback or comments that we can rely on because he isn't sure we are as accurate as we could be. Haugen responded that one of the big differences with this study versus our transportation plan update, and hopefully you've seen it be more successful in the past when we do these site specific studies, is that formation of the Steering Committee. He explained that we have property owners, business owners, etc., that are impacted by the study participate as part of the Steering Committee and through that process we tend to flesh out these items a whole lot more than we are able to with our metro-wide planning efforts, so you will see this with Mr. Viafara's presentation on the Mn220 North Study, and it is also being suggested that a Steering Committee made up of people who have strong interest in the area being studied to meet on a regular basis to inform us. Vein stated that he thinks that is very helpful, and is a step in the right direction, but what really brought this out for him was when he looked at the potential for a cul-de-sac because if you do something like that that would impact a lot more people than just the adjacent property owners and would be a community wide impact. He said that he asks this because he doesn't have an answer or a suggestion, but he sometimes thinks it would be good to work at what processes might get better opportunity for input; he worries because we get a few comments and go in a direction that's not necessary just because some showed up for a meeting but their views aren't truly indicative of what the population wants.

Grasser commented that he thinks it is a greater problem on the broader planning level, it is better when we get into the smaller scopes, but we have talked about that before too at other venues about when we get people together, and again you're doing the visioning things saying, what would you like, there isn't any financial, political or any kind of constraints so a lot of times at those discussions so you get input, but how valid is it. He said, though, that he doesn't have any answer on how to do it better either.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH KLJ TO PERFORM THE US 2/US 81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY, AS PRESENTED.

Malm commented that one thing you need to do is, when you're asking about this you've got to give very specific alternatives of what you are going to do; you don't give them 40 alternatives because you have to start simplifying what you are going to get from them; maybe give them two alternatives so when you get people there they all understand that if it doesn't go here it is going to go there, or you just pass the buck on to the next one and then you have the same thing all over again. He said that he thinks so often when we ask people to make decisions we have to be very specific on what we are looking for until we decide to do that we aren't going to get anyplace.

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

Voting Nay: Malm.

Abstain: None.

Absent: DeMers and Mock.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON 2045 STREET AND HIGHWAY ELEMENT

Haugen reported that this is just to update everyone on the process status, adding, however, that he is sure that most of you are aware of where we are at on it.

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

Haugen stated that we have received preliminary approval from both Planning Commissions and City Councils, and Polk County has taken final action on approving the document. He added that there was a lot of discussion on the North Dakota side about additional river crossings, but not as much on the Minnesota side.

Haugen said that the only substantial change that he is aware of that they have received was that MnDOT has asked us to better incorporate our current T.I.P. document and the projects in that T.I.P. document to show they are still consistent with this plan. He stated that it is an easily accomplished requirement, it is just a rather unusual request as in the past six transportation plan updates we have done, that has never been a point of clarification in any of them but now it has come up on this one. He said, again, that this is the only real substantial change that you will see, that we have to do a little more work on addressing and identifying what is in our current T.I.P.

Vein commented that, again, this plan doesn't have a date for when it is going to be specifically installed; and he is referencing the southend bridge. Haugen responded that that is correct, it is not identified within that window. Grasser added that it is actually an illustrative project, so it isn't in any of the time bands.

Haugen referred to the calendars and stated that they are doing a presentation to the NDDOT on November 27th, and will begin the final approval process in December. He went over the schedule briefly.

Vein commented that the Grand Forks City Council gave preliminary approval on Monday night and they did have two council members vote against it. He said that he tried to make the case for why it needs to be approved; he firmly believes it is the plan is what we want to move forward with, but he thinks the concern that was stated was that technically we have proven that the proposed bridge locations are the right ones, we just didn't have enough input from the local community even though we have had meetings for everyone to attend. He added that he hasn't received a single call in objection to the plan.

Information only.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON MN 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY

Viafara reported that concerning the comments about the importance of public participation, a great deal of effort has been made to put together a Steering Committee representing business owners and people with interest on the improvements of the Mn 220 North Corridor.

Viafara referred to a slide listing the committee members and stated that so far these are the members, including one Mr. Jeff Westrom, representing Hugo's, and they received, also, an interest by Mr. Ken Visek, who is a business representative that would like to sit on the committee to partake and provide some guidance to the consultant and to the MPO when advancing this project.

Viafara stated that they held their first Steering Committee meeting last week, and it was very well attended. He added that consultant did have the opportunity to review the first tech memo. He

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

explained that this technical memo addresses the following issues: Land Use, Infrastructure Assessment, Access Management, Multimodal Transportation Assessment, Environmental Assessment, and Traffic Forecast. He commented that the memo is available and the minutes are being distributed to all the related parties, so if members of the Board would like copies of these documents please let him know.

Viafara commented that staff is working with the consultant and members of the Steering Committee to assure that we will have our next meeting as planned, either the week of December 10th or the following week, and this is given some constraints coming from both members of the Steering Committee and also whether the consultant may be available.

Viafara stated that part of the involvement for this project involves, entails putting together a survey, so they are working with the consultant to draft a survey that will be available electronically and also canvassed door-to-door to gain more support, so that is where the project is at this time. He said that they have also been extending an invitation to the East Grand Forks City Council to become more aware of what is happening and also to provide further guidance from the decision making point-of-view.

Haugen reported that a link to this information is available on the MPOs website.

Vein asked if the MPO tracks how many hits they get on their website, and maybe what is being looked at. McNelis responded that that information is available if requested.

Information only.

MATTER OF SOLICITATION OF 2020-2023 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS

Haugen reported that this would be the time of year when we announce the open solicitation for the Minnesota side projects. He explained that because of the every fourth year City Subtarget we are starting to look at the Year 2023, which is not the fourth year for East Grand Forks so we are looking to see if Polk County has any projects that are using federal funds or if the State of Minnesota has any projects.

Haugen stated that on the North Dakota side there are two programs that are open for project solicitation; and the first one is Recreational Trails, which is an annual solicitation that takes place and entail federal highway dollars that are flexed over to the North Dakota Parks and Rec Department to build trails in more park settings for most types of trail uses including motorized and non-motorized, whereas in the Transportation Alternative Program some of the uses recreational trails allow are prohibited.

Haugen said that the Recreational Trails projects are due to the MPO in January.

Haugen commented that we also have another round of FTA Capital dollars solicitation open. He explained that this is unusual and we did just conclude one round of capital for FTA solicitation, and that will end and we will have a month off then begin the next round, so we are being blessed by Transit Capital dollars in North Dakota.

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

Haugen said that, if you will recall, we had a list of ten priorities that we submitted with our latest round of solicitation, and we had some discussion on where the UND coaches fell on that list, they were 5th, and we will know that decision by the NDDOT next week, so when we open up this solicitation Grand Forks will know whether or not those coaches were funded or if they would be the next prioritized project to submit for the next round of solicitation.

Haugen commented that the good news is that we are going to be doing a lot of transit capital solicitation, and hopefully programming projects the next six months or so here in Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that they aren't really anticipating anything from the Minnesota side; the next big project the MnDOT has identified is the replacement of the bridge over River Road on US 2, and that is set to take place in 2025/2026. He added that Polk County traditionally never uses their federal funds in our study area, so he wouldn't anticipate too many Minnesota projects in January.

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 10/13/18 to 11/16/18 Period

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

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO ADJOURN THE NOVEMBER 21ST, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:58 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager