

# **2018 MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD MINUTES**

**January 17, 2018 Minutes**

**February 21, 2018 Minutes**

**February 22, 2018 Special Joint Bridge Minutes**

**March 21, 2018 Minutes**

**April 18, 2018 Minutes**

**May 16, 2018 Minutes**

**June 20, 2018 Minutes**

**July 18, 2018 Minutes**

**August 22, 2018 Minutes**

**September 19, 2018 Minutes**

**October 17, 2018 Minutes**

**November 21, 2018 Minutes**

**December 19, 2018 Minutes**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the January 17<sup>th</sup>, 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: Al Grasser, Jeannie Mock, Mike Powers, Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, and Ken Vein.

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; 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 DECEMBER 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2017, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

Vetter pointed out that there were some members of the board absent at the December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017 meeting and they are not shown as such in the minutes.

***MOTION, SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF LIST OF MEMBERS ABSENT, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE**

Haugen reported that normally this would be the time that we would see the Minnesota Candidate projects for our T.I.P.; however, as noted in the staff report there are not MnDOT or Polk County projects. He said that, as a reminder, MnDOT does still have programmed improvements out at U.S.#2 and U.S.Bus#2 intersection in 2021, so there is that one MnDOT project, there just isn't anything for next year.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that every four years East Grand Forks receives City Sub-Target funds, and 2018 they were to receive those funds and they originally had programmed a roundabout at Bygland and Rhinehart, but then decided to amend it out and delay it until 2022, which is when they are scheduled to receive the City Sub-Target funds again.

Haugen pointed out that included in the application for the roundabout at Bygland and Rhinehart; they have updated the nomination form that needs to be filled out, there wasn't too much information that needed to be changed on it, although they did update the cost estimate to reflect 2022 year of expenditure. He stated that in comparing this to the original 2018 estimate on the nomination form they are within \$6,000 of each other.

Haugen said that included in the packet was a more current concept drawing of the roundabout as well. He commented that it was originally scoped as a compact roundabout, meaning the diameter would be less than 90-feet; the current concept shows the diameter as being 120-feet, thus brought up to a more modern roundabout design concept.

Haugen stated that, again, this is the only application we have for consideration on the Minnesota side for candidate projects for the 2019-2022 T.I.P. He added that it is consistent with the MPOs transportation plans, and is our top priority.

Haugen said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO staff recommend you approve it and forward it on to the A.T.P.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE MINNESOTA SIDE AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: Strandell and Powers.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT #2 TO THE ANNUAL UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that a while back staff informed the board that, due to some grant issues, the NDDOT utilized 2014 federal funding for most of our 2017 calendar year billings, and that then freed up our 2017 funds, thus we have requested our jurisdictions to nominate work activities for those 2017 funds.

Haugen stated that last month this body approved \$22,000 out of these available funds for the additional river crossings analysis. He said that this month the City of East Grand Forks is submitting a request for us to assist them with their ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan.

Haugen commented that included in the packet is the amendment, with a total budgeted amount of \$50,000; with \$35,000 for possible consultant assistance on it. He pointed out that the actual write-up is highlighted in yellow on the table under Special Studies.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen reported that this is a requirement of ADA since its inception back in the early 1990s; however Minnesota and the Federal Highway Administration in Minnesota are placing greater emphasis on progression of making the right-of-way fully accessible for those with disabilities, and so they have given the Minnesota jurisdictions that receive federal transportation funds until the end of 2019 to have up-to-date transition plans established, so East Grand Forks is in the process of addressing their plan and are asking us for help with their right-of-way area. He added that East Grand Forks will, on their own, have to do their own buildings and other facilities, we will just be assisting them in their right-of-way.

Haugen stated that other MPOs across the State of Minnesota are also assisting their jurisdictions, so the dollar value is based more on what the FM/Cog and the City of Moorhead are doing together, jointly, on their ADA Right-of-Way Transition Plan. He said that if you look at the square mileage on both communities, East Grand Forks is roughly a third of that, and that is the same with the population figures, so we took a third of their contracted amount and used that as our budget scope for their study.

Haugen referred to the financial table, and pointed out that we are now, with this amendment and the previous amendment, budgeting \$100,000 of the \$300,000+ of the 2017 funds available, so we still have the capability of several additional studies that may come to us during the 2018 year, but we do need approval of this body to amend the work program to identify this work activity to be done so that next month we can move forward with a detailed scope-of-work, and then to decide if we want to pursue an RFP for the consultant selection, or because of the value we are budgeting we could go a different route if we want.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.***

Vein asked, there is money remaining, is there anything on the forefront of what additional studying may be needed in East Grand Forks this calendar year. Haugen responded that they aren't aware of anything pending on the East Grand Forks side. He added, however, that the funds that are available aren't only for Minnesota efforts, they are available for both sides of the river. Vein said, then, that we aren't seeing anything for either side at this point. Haugen commented that they did have some conversations, since we are doing the right-of-way transition plan for one side of the river, if the other side wants assistance or not. He said that he doesn't know if the Grand Forks City staff has considered that or not.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF DRAFT RFP FOR 2018 AERIAL PHOTOS**

Haugen reported that Ms. Kouba had to participate in a North Dakota Transit meeting so was unable to be here today to speak on this item, therefore he will do so.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that every three years we do an update of our aerial photos. He said that this RFP follows a required format and is very similar to what we did three years ago. He referred to a map and pointed out the area that will be covered, adding that it isn't just the city-proper, as we do go out over our entire MPO study area.

Haugen commented that the amount we had budgeted in our work program is \$45,000, so we have \$42,000 for consultant costs.

Haugen reported that if we receive approval today we will still have to go through the NDDOT's qualification base selection process, which will allow us to have consideration of a final contract in March, and hopefully that will allow us to have the area flown prior to the trees leafing out in mid-April or early May, and then by fall we will get the final product from the vendor.

Vein asked if you want to do the photos when the leaves are off the trees, so you do it either early spring or late fall. Haugen responded that late fall is very tricky because most trees have different schedules for when they lose their leaves, but in the spring most trees don't yet have their leaves at the same time, so spring is the preferred time. He added that also try to do it with the least amount of snow being on the ground, and the least amount of flooding if there is any.

Powers asked how far south they will be flying. Haugen responded that it is essentially just past Merrifield Road, so we include all of the Merrifield corridor; a full mile and a half past Merrifield.

DeMers asked if there was any chance, and this may be for the county representatives, of coordinating this with the counties, do you know what the counties schedule are for their photogrammetry, because he is wondering if we want to see what the counties are doing, and what their schedules are because, obviously we have a limit as to what we are going to spend, but if we can do three projects at once maybe we could get a reduction in cost. Strandell commented that he doesn't know what Polk County's plan is, but he will find out. Haugen said that he believes that Ms. Kouba tried to coordinate this with our Technical Advisory Committee members, which include the county representatives. He added that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting the Polk County Representative was not there, but the Grand Forks County Representative indicated that they were fine with this schedule, and this study area.

Haugen reported that the Technical Advisory Committee also had a lot of discussion about LiDAR, and whether or not we want to do that as well, but the consensus was that there are other resources available that provide LiDAR so we aren't going with that option. DeMers commented that this is a valuable resource, not just for the MPO, but a lot of other entities use it as well. Strandell stated that he knows that they haven't been able to get any final flood plain zoning LiDAR, for some reason it hasn't gotten approved, and he doesn't know where the hang-up is.

Vein asked if LiDAR is primarily for contour mapping. DeMers responded that it is for elevation. Vein stated that this already has LiDAR contour mapping. Strandell said that he doesn't know what kind of overlap there is. Vein explained that he was a part of the International Water Institute, who did the whole Red River Basin, south of the border, so LiDAR

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

already exists for this area, he just doesn't know what level of accuracy they did, but that has been in place for years. Haugen commented that that was part of the Technical Advisory Committee's discussion; the fact that LiDAR exists already for most of the area. He said that they were told that Minnesota, just on the Minnesota side of course, a more recent LiDAR inventory in place; and he doesn't know how that addresses your flood plain map. Strandell said that this is just a subject that hasn't been on their table lately, or where it stands, other than that they haven't been able to get final word on flood plain elevations.

Haugen stated that of the jurisdictions that are part of the MPO, the East Grand Forks Water and Light were the ones that were expressing some interest on LiDAR, and after the Technical Advisory Committee meeting they now know where they can get some of their LiDAR resources instead of through this process, no one else was really expressing interest in LiDAR.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE RFP FOR THE AERIAL IMAGERY PROJECT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

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

Haugen stated that included in the packet is an update on where we are at in the process. He commented that most of the staff report is written for other people as it is commenting on the action you took at your last meeting, so some of it is just rehashing what this body took action on, but we did eliminate 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, so we did negotiate our revised scope-of-work, and got both A.T.A.C. and Kimley-Horn to that \$22,000.00 threshold.

Haugen stated that A.T.A.C. will be getting the travel demand model results and will give those results to Kimley-Horn, and then they will produce the traffic analysis, similar to the one we saw when we were discussing it.

Haugen commented that he expects to have this information available at our next Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Policy Board meetings.

Haugen stated that as part of this we should also have our 2030 and 2045 Traffic Analysis of where we are expecting growth in traffic and what issues it may cause us, so it won't just be river crossings for discussion.

Haugen said that, as you will recall, at the end of our meeting last month Mr. Malm reported on some discussion that the County Board had taken the previous day, particularly on the Grand Forks Merrifield Road area. He explained that, as noted in the draft minutes, which we just approved; there is a need for some clarification as to Mr. Malm's statement that the county is talking about setting aside 3 mills over an 8 year period to fund their side of a bridge at Merrifield. He said that when he talked to Mr. West about this, he indicated that it was really

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

just discussion, and that he isn't aware of any direction given to him that he was to pursue these things, but instead he felt that he was just planting a seed as to what could be done and to just start a conversation about it, so it isn't as definitive as the minutes state, it is still being discussed, correct. Malm responded that that is correct.

Malm explained that at their County meeting yesterday someone questioned this, and he said that all Mr. West is doing is going out and finding out what the people want, and this is just one proposal, one suggestion and the committee said that they would think about doing it. He added that when he made the comment "taking the lead" it doesn't mean going ahead with anything specific, it means investigating with the other groups like Polk County, the States, etc.

Haugen commented that he did provide Mr. West with a copy of the Merrifield Bridge Feasibility Study Report that we have, so he has a fairly good understanding of the feasibility of a structure at that location.

Haugen reported that they have draft Goals and Objectives for review and comment. He said that they have had a lot of discussion about autonomous vehicles and some discussion on connected vehicles. He commented that, because of that, they weren't really covering those topics well in the Goals/Objectives/Standards so they are proposing adding the following language to Goal #6:

Objective #5: Consider advances in autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles technology in the transportation planning and programming processes.

Standards:

Participate in state and national autonomous vehicle and connected vehicle planning efforts.

Support implementation in autonomous vehicle and connected vehicle technology that collectively provide the increased transportation options for people and freight.

Recognize and address autonomous vehicles and connected vehicles changes at the local, regional, state and national level that influence the metro area's transportation system.

Haugen explained that the reason for adding this to Goal #6 is because Goal #6 already has discussion regarding our ITS Regional Architecture. He said that in 2019 the work program shows that we will be proposing updating our ITS Regional Architecture. He explained that the primary reason for this is because now the architecture is addressing connected vehicles and autonomous vehicles and we need to have it in place, so that is Objective #4; Objective #5 is the one that specifically talks about autonomous and connected vehicle technology. He pointed out that they are basically saying that we will keep as up-to-date with this as we can.

Haugen commented that they asked the Technical Advisory Committee for their comments, and he hopes to get them by Friday.

Haugen reported that next month we have been asked to make a decision on what we are doing for Safety Performance Targets, and we have had a lot of discussion about setting the target. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

added that the other half of that is the programming and what it means if we are setting targets, how that might or might not impact the programming.

Haugen stated that they were not able to schedule; that originally at the Technical Advisory Committee we talked about having both States come and provide us some dialogue on the safety target and programming side of it, but our Technical Advisory Committee schedule didn't coincide with other people's schedules so we are still trying to figure it all out. He added that tomorrow the MPOs are meeting with MnDOT to talk about safety target setting and programming so we will try to get it nailed down a bit more. He said that there are no set meetings at this time with the NDDOT, so we are trying to understand that programming side of this, but he thinks we have a good understanding of what each States targets are, so if we decide to do targets at the local level, what those could be so we are just trying to get that last piece of information as to whether or not impact programming, and if it does is it negative or positive.

Haugen commented that you will be asked at next month's meeting if you want to establish your own local targets or if you just want to use the States targets on the safety side.

Haugen reported that just to expand on not just safety targets, but they are working with both State DOTs on obtaining the data for the other target levels as well. He explained that PM2 (performance measure 2) are bridge and pavement conditions; and PM3 (performance measure 3) are travel time reliabilities for vehicles, and specifically for freight vehicles. He said that they are still working on these data sets, and are moving forward, but they are still struggling a bit to get an understanding of how the safety program side is changing, or may change due to not having the safety targets in place.

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

Grasser stated that he is wondering if, the bridge element that we are now doing, does that warrant a sub-topic within the 2045 Street/Highway Plan work activity; should it be a sub-target as far as its completion date and work activities. He said that he is still trying to make sure that he has in his head all the pieces that go into the Long Range Transportation Plan, and all those different components that have to come together at the end.

Grasser said that one other comment he has is that maybe some of the things that are shown on this update, such as the GIS, Corridor Preservation, and other on-going activities that we don't have anything targeted, is it really useful, or can they be dropped off.

Vein said that right now Mr. Grasser has two different questions, one on the bridge part of the 2045 Street and Highway Plan, is that correct. Grasser responded that that would be one of them that came to his mind when we were talking about it because it is talking about that special element.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein asked if the completion dates are separate between the bridge portion of the project and the total Street and Highway Plan project. Haugen responded that conceivably yes, if you wanted to make a decision that you are either not going to try to fund any bridges by 2045 but you have the analysis, then that could be done early in the process and then by the time we get to the final 2045 plan we no longer are trying to identify or wrestle with the bridge issue, so in that sense, yes; but if you want to go the opposite direction we would probably wrestle with that until the end of the 2045 Street and Highway Element.

Vein said that he knows that this has come out as a specific issue, the bridges, and what are we going to do with it probably has more interest than maybe the overall plan does. Grasser stated that from his perspective he thinks we need to have something a little more targeted and focused there because right now it is just the traffic analysis part, right, so he doesn't want us to lose track of this thing eighteen months from now and he thinks the issue is going to float back up among the City Councils, so he doesn't think we will be able to have our best foot forward if we continue to not have any answers, so he would like to see it shown as a sub-target.

Vein commented that if we wait until the very end and go in a different direction we may have to revise the plan depending on where those bridges would be, so it would seem to be an important sub-set to know earlier before you finish the final plan. Haugen responded that staffs intent is, after the February meeting, assuming that we have the results from this added scope, and after the board has had a chance to review them and get comfortable with them, we would have another joint meeting to present that data to everyone, and the hope would be that we can further narrow down locations so that way if we need to go to the next step of further analysis, he hopes that we aren't still studying all four locations.

Vein asked if the joint meeting would be like the one we had earlier with the various entities. Haugen responded it would be like that. Vein said, though, that any motion made at that meeting would still come from the MPO. Haugen responded that that is correct. He added that we would try to make sure that we capture both County Commissions because of this recent action that the Grand Forks County is leading for this specific site, so we would try to make sure that both county commissions are aware of, and invited to this meeting.

Grasser said, then, that it might be that the data portion of this contract would be available in the next 30 to 60 days, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct. Grasser stated that, again, whatever the dates are he thinks it would be good to have them because then we all have the same frame of mind as to what the timeframe is. Vein added that he thinks it would be nice to get that resolved sooner rather than later anyway.

Consensus was to add the bridge portion of the study as a sub-target and to remove the on-going activities.

b. Bill Listing For 12/16/17 to 1/12/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the December 16, 2017 to January 12, 2018 period was included in the packet.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

c. Federal Government Shut-Down

Haugen reported that you are probably hearing things about a possible federal government shut-down this Friday. He stated that it is sounding rather “iffy” on whether or not they will accomplish a resolution, but from the MPO operations perspective, it won’t impact us, per-say, but there is potential impact to other federal highway and federal transit programs depending on how long the shut-down is.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2017, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:35 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mike Powers, (in Chairman Vein's absence), called the February 21<sup>st</sup>, 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: Gary Malm, Warren Strandell, Clarence Vetter, Al Grasser, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, and Mike Powers.

Absent were: Ken Vein.

Guest(s): Jane Williams, Grand Forks Engineering.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Powers declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT RFQ FOR EAST GRAND FORKS RIGHT-OF-WAY ADA TRANSITION PLAN**

Kouba reported that this is a request from the City of East Grand Forks. She explained that they have been talking to MnDOT and FHWA, who are encouraging the Cities of Minnesota to do a written transition plan, so they have asked for our assistance in accomplishing this.

Kouba stated that we have put together a Request For Quotes, and are following NDDOT's process, and will send it to their approved list of engineers. She said that it is hoped that by doing this we will get several quotes from which to choose from to help us do the plan.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFQ FOR THE EAST GRAND FORKS RIGHT-OF-WAY ADA TRANSITION PLAN.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Vein.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO 2018-2021 MINNESOTA SIDE T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that included in the packet are the actual project listings that are being amended. He explained that East Grand Forks was going to construct a larger area of Rhinehart Drive, near its intersection with Bygland Road; but as they were doing further work on the potential round-about in 2022, they have discovered that more of Rhinehart might be impacted by it, so instead of building a new Rhinehart, and four years later having to tear part of it out, they would like to transfer a chunk of the funds for the Rhinehart project to do some sidewalk ADA right-of-way compliance on 17<sup>th</sup>, so they are shortening the length of one project that is already in the T.I.P. and shifting the monies to a new project on 17<sup>th</sup>. He said that they did hold a public hearing at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, but there was no one present for discussion, nor were any written comments submitted, thus both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff are recommending approval.

Powers asked if this will come back up in 2022. Haugen responded that nothing that we are doing today will come back. He added that if the round-about is built than that segment of Rhinehart that is not being done now it will be done with the round-about. He added that if the round-about is not done, then that segment of Rhinehart will need to be addressed.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #2 TO THE 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM SUBJECT TO PARTNER AGENCY REVIEW.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Vein.*

**MATTER OF FHWA/MN GUIDANCE ON INCORPORATING PERFORMANCE MEASURES INTO T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that we received guidance from Minnesota Federal Highway; however we typically get all of our guidance or direction from our North Dakota partners, but this particular time we have a Minnesota only T.I.P. document that is separate from the North Dakota T.I.P., so Minnesota believes that they are the proper agency to give guidance.

Haugen commented that at the end of May, of this year, if we are going to make any changes to our T.I.P. document, as we just did with the last agenda item, after May we have to incorporate a write-up of how these performance measures are being used in our decision making, and Minnesota Federal Highway is suggesting, along with MnDOT, that instead of waiting for a time when we have to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

address a T.I.P. action, that we go ahead and amend our existing T.I.P., whether there is a project or not, and just amend the write-up to include this framework of the performance measures into the T.I.P.

Haugen stated that a couple of agenda items from now you will be acting on Safety Targets, so by May we would have to incorporate how we are using our safety measures into our decision making.

Haugen explained that this is a guidance document, it is not mandatory, both the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff feel that since it is just guidance, that we could hold off and wait to see if we are actually going to do any amendment to the T.I.P., and if we are at that time we would address and incorporate this guidance at that time. He said that the question is do we want to go ahead and follow the guidance and write something up and amend our T.I.P. before May or do we want to wait until there is an actual project that forces us to amend our T.I.P. and address it then, and we are recommending we wait.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE WAITING UNTIL AFTER MAY TO INCORPORATE PERFORMANCE MEASURES INTO THE T.I.P., UNLESS THE NEED TO ADDRESS A CHANGE TO THE T.I.P. OCCURS FIRST.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO WORK PROGRAM TO UPDATE  
WASHINGTON STREET UNDERPASS ANALYSIS**

Haugen stated that the NDDOT has finally set aside and programmed the roughly \$18,000,000 to reconstruct the underpass on Washington Street. He commented that the next agenda item you will see that they have tentatively programmed it for 2022. He added that the next agenda item we are soliciting candidate projects for the next T.I.P., and one of the projects was a \$100,000 project to make sure that FY2022 is the proper year to do a reconstruction of the underpass, and as the Technical Advisory Committee discussed, an agreement that we should go ahead and not fund it with pavement dollars but instead fund it with planning dollars instead.

Haugen said that, as you are aware, we do have some extra planning dollars waiting for projects, and the way this is worded the MPO would initiate the planning study, because the project is programmed in 2022, the project development process will happen. He added that typically that wouldn't happen for a year or more, however on this project the NDDOT is saying that they want to get it going right away because of right-of-way acquisitions and also coordination with the railroad.

Haugen commented that, normally, because they would be doing the project development right-of-way, they would be going through their process of making the selection and funding of that work, but due to congress's continuing resolutions on appropriations, the flow of federal funds to the State of North Dakota is not optimal, so what we are proposing here is that we will start the study, take it as far as we can go with planning dollars, and then it will transition then over to the NDDOT to do the project development that is not fundable from the planning dollar side. He added that this isn't our normal

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

practice, however it has been done this way elsewhere in North Dakota, and so we are just trying to get this timed so we are not waiting for the flow of federal funds, and do something with the funds we have sitting that can do it.

Haugen stated that the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff are recommending that we amend, or program assigned dollars to this activity. He added that we still have to go through the process of the Request for Qualifications, and that will take a few months to do, so he is just offering that there might be a possibility that by the time that we actually can execute a contract, NDDOT's federal funding flow might be resolved to the point where they may just take it from the start and not really utilize us, but we are getting this framed-up so that we aren't being delayed just because of appropriation dollars on a continuing resolution.

Haugen said that there is a question about an exact scope-of-work that we would be writing up. He explained that it would be worked out if we move forward with this, but generally it is look at the concrete on the structure itself, it has an irreversible non-repairable chemical reaction taking place that is further complicated by the freeze thaw action that takes place, so that is what we are recommending here, and, again, it is a little atypical, but it keeps something in motion. He added that this may not end up us doing any part of the study, it may end up with us starting the project and then handing it over to the NDDOT.

Grasser commented that it seemed to be a good process that got worked out, trying to keep things moving there, otherwise we tend to wait and then something happens and then we wait some more; as managers of the system of the DOT we want to know how much longer that bridge may last, so we felt it is very important to have this study, and he thinks that putting planning dollars into that is a good move.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

Haugen commented that we are using a budget number of \$80,000.00 in our work program; the request was for \$100,000.00, but because of the trade-off, the exchange of what we can do and what the NDDOT will take over, we are using a lesser amount. He added that we had been using \$250,000.00 as the federal funds that are available, so with your action today that leaves us roughly \$140,000.00 left and we believe there is probably another \$200,000.00 now that we got the audit out of the way, so there is probably close to \$400,000.00 left to be assigned to activities.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2019-2022 T.I.P. CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE**

Haugen reported that, with the decision earlier this year on how North Dakota was going to fund the Main Street Initiative, now called the Urban Grant Program, we were in a position to solicit for the rest of the North Dakota Federal Funding Programs. He stated that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, he highlighted in the staff report, there were differences between the MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee recommendations that he will go over. He added, however, that typically we have our responsibilities, and you have seen the front of this power point every year, to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

make sure that things are consistent with our plan, and that they are prioritized within the funding constraints that we have, the area that we look into, the type of projects (not just federally funded one). He said that we still have some unknowns of what FAST is going to do, just as we talked about earlier regarding incorporating performance measures into our T.I.P. document, there are still more unknowns coming down the road.

Haugen commented that, year of expenditure, we also have to make sure that as projects are programmed in the out years they are inflated appropriately for what that outer year expenditure will be.

Haugen stated that with the Main Street Initiative, and the impact on the Urban Local side, it is still more dollars than we had prior to FAST-ACT coming into that program; so with that there are the three separate programs that we will have candidate projects from; Urban Grant, Urban Local, and Urban Regional.

a. Urban Grant

Haugen said that, just as a refresher of what is all intended to be done with these funds; the City and UND have worked out an application, one for each year, and are tying it into both UND's concept of Columbia/Coulee Revitalization, and there is an already programmed project to do a mill and overlay of University Avenue. He said that UND is going to provide all of the local match.

Haugen stated that the first application, for 2019, the first year the funds are available, is a median focus on University; and the second application, for 2020, is to do ornamental lighting, bus shelters, etc., so included in your packet were a detailed cost estimate for each of the two applications, plus some renderings of what might happen.

Haugen referred to the first rendering, and explained that it focuses on what median treatment might occur and trying to address conflicting turning movements and ped movements crossing almost anywhere possible, to focus them on specific points. He said that you will also notice some ornamental lightings, banners, etc., that will be done with the second application.

Haugen commented that the last thing is that they are pricing out for three new bus shelters. He said that the current bus shelters are standard bus shelters that are throughout the community, these would be architecturally integrated into the rest of the campus corps concept.

Powers asked what the capacity is of one of those bus shelters. Haugen responded that that isn't identified, but typically there is room for five to six people sitting, however the one that is currently in front of the Memorial Union, are two large ones that offer mostly standing room, and they probably hold ten each, so ten to twenty people.

Haugen commented that both the Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Staff recommend you find the two applications consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, and also give them both priority ranking, successively.

Grasser stated that, by way of maybe some additional information just for the Board's knowledge; this is a program that the Governor rolled out last fall, and everybody is in kind of a reactionary mode. He said

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

that part of what, from the City and UND's perspective is that we didn't think we really wanted to try to do a downtown project in FY2019 and FY2020 because we will be looking at reconstruction of DeMers in FY2019 and FY2020, plus 5<sup>th</sup>, and the mill and overlay on University is in FY2020, so we thought a good candidate project would be to tie into the ideas that are being generated by UND, the President's Concept.

Grasser reported that there is a detailed cost estimate there, and we need to make sure that that doesn't give a false impression, that that is exactly the work that is going to get done. He explained that they had to come up with an estimate for a grant, and UND is still working on the scoping of all these things, they just really formulated some of the committees and working groups by which they are going to start trying to flesh out the President's concept on Coulee to Columbia.

Grasser commented that another thing they looked at from the City's side was trying to target concepts for the Coulee to Columbia, are quite a bit more dollars than they are showing in here, because the whole thing could be a \$3 to \$4 million dollar potential project. He explained that what they did was to try, given the limited dollars that we have on a statewide basis, and the fact that they have to compete, was to try to taper the projects down to roughly a \$1 million dollar project. He said that they didn't want them to get too big because we probably wouldn't be successful when we are competing against the rest of the State.

Grasser stated that they targeted the FY2019 project for one that might have more impact on curbs and things like that, and the FY2020 project that wouldn't likely interfere with the mill and overlay project, as lighting and such can be done on the side.

Grasser said that this is just a philosophical background as to why some of those projects got selected, and what they are about. He reiterated that it is really early, and in a normal year we wouldn't have made these applications yet because the concepts are so ill-defined, but working with the circumstances we've got, that is what they came up with for FY2019 and FY2020 projects.

Powers asked if the need to rank these long range plans. Haugen responded that each of these T.I.P. projects do need to be ranked, prioritized, and this particular program has one for each year, so they aren't really competing against each other, they are each the number one prioritized for each successive year, and that is what both the Technical Advisory Committee and the MPO Staff are recommending, that you find them consistent and prioritize them as number one for each identified year.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FY2019 AND FY2020 URBAN GRANT PROGRAM CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING FOR EACH SUCCESSIVE YEAR.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

- b. Urban Local
- c. Urban Regional

Haugen commented that the next two programs are ones that we are familiar with because we do them every year. He stated that, typically what we do is to first look at the current three years of the T.I.P. that have been programmed for a while to see if there are any proposed changes, and then we look at the last year of the T.I.P. for new projects.

Haugen reported that this year, the theme through our agenda today, is that things are a little different, if you haven't noticed. He said that the very first agenda item we are doing quotes instead of proposals, we are doing a work program amendment to keep the ball rolling that we typically wouldn't be doing. He pointed out that here, in our program, we are starting from not the adopted T.I.P. but from a tentative programmed document the NDDOT released to show the results of the Main Street Initiative decision.

Haugen pointed out that this is the program that was released to show what they are actually programming in FY2021, and also, in the case of the underpass, in order to get the full \$18 million dollars they are programming it in FY2022, so this is something that isn't adopted yet, but it is what they are basing their programming decisions on as we submit the candidate projects.

Haugen referred to a slide and explained that it shows the two new projects that are in the tentative program. He added that the rest are all current projects that we have programmed; there is one exception to a change on this project here, on North Washington there are three separate segments that were scheduled to be done; in the current T.I.P./S.T.I.P. they are programmed in FY2020, but in the tentative program, to balance and get the Washington Underpass fully funded, they had to shift some projects statewide, and they are recommending this get shifted to FY2019 instead of FY2020, and we will talk about it a little later because there is another change being proposed for that particular project.

Haugen stated, then, that instead of typically going off of an adopted document, we are starting from a tentatively approved document because of the indecision on FY2021 projects the last T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle; so these are just being identified and reaffirming what the 2021 project is, it is here on North Washington, the overpass, is just reconstruction through 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and University Avenue, that was our request for this cycle, and they are showing they will fund this program.

Haugen commented that last year we requested, in FY2021, an underpass project, but they could only program it in FY2022. He referred to slides offering some renderings of what that structure could look like. He said that there are some right-of-way impacts, and one of the bigger decisions is on the shoe-fly, which side of the current tracks do you allow train operations to be maintained; if you go on the north side you have some property acquisition impacts, on the south side you might be able to squeeze and not impact a building, but you may have to impact it, so that is one of the reasons why, in our previous discussion we talked about normally the project development wouldn't start for an FY2022 project, but with issues like this, North Dakota is trying to get ahead of the game and make sure they can deliver in FY2022.

Haugen referred to a slide and stated that, with this as our baseline, this highlights the changes that we received from the City and the NDDOT District Office on candidate projects, and so you will notice that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

instead of moving that three segments of North Washington to FY2019, the request is to delay it to FY2021, and they did adjust the cost estimate for the extra year of expenditure.

Haugen commented that also in FY2020 there are two new projects being requested, the first one is for some other segments of Washington Street, one on the southside of DeMers to Hammerling, to mill and overlay that; and the other is the northside of the underpass, to mill and overlay that as well.

Haugen stated that the second request we have for FY2020 is to start the NEPA document for a potential 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange. He added that this is a \$2 million dollar project, but you will notice that there is only \$80,000 in federal funding, as the City is proposing that they will pay half of the \$2 million dollars, so the federal would only go towards half of the NDDOT share of \$1 million dollars.

Haugen reported that they are still programming the regional projects in FY2022; the study may or may not change that, but there are two new additional projects that are related; redoing the traffic signal system in Grand Forks, there are signals on both the regional system, which would be the larger dollar value, and there are signals on the local system, which would be the smaller dollar amount.

Haugen stated that when we review these changes we need to make sure that we are consistent with our planning documents and also that we are consistent with the fiscal constraint issue that is placed on the T.I.P./S.T.I.P., and this is where we had differences between the MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee; particularly when it comes to the South Washington Street, between DeMers and Hammerling. He explained that what is being suggested is a mill and overlay, what is in the Transportation Plan is a full reconstruction. He stated that the mill and overlay will address the surface, the reconstruction would fix a lot of the other issues that are along that stretch including off-set intersections, driveway consolidations, and both transit and pedestrian issues along the corridor.

Haugen commented that some of these projects are trying to squeeze more lemonade out of lemons that have been long squeezed, so fiscal constraint is a concern, specifically whether there are funds available to put some of these projects in the years being requested.

Haugen referred to a slide and said that, just to give you a sense of those projects, this is the FY2020 request of the two segments, the mill and overlay, the NEPA documentation with the cost split, \$2 million with \$1 million from the City and \$80,000 in federal funding. He explained that for the NEPA project the federal funding source, if the NDDOT decides to fund the project, it wouldn't really be coming from the same construction dollars, so the T.I.P. program is more addressing construction dollars and not other types of fund; and the urban signals and regional signals are for information; and so, again, we had a difference of opinion between the Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee as to whether or not these are consistent with the plan, and we have two recommendations before you on these applications.

Haugen reported that we always do one and beyond on the North Dakota side for the Regional System, so there is an FY2023 request to consider the actual construction of the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Interchange. He stated that normally on this we don't take formal action, it is just informing us that that might be the next candidate project.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Grasser apologized, stating that maybe staff, he isn't sure how they titled some of the documentation that was submitted, but the NEPA document is technically going to be a document on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, it is trying to resolve those problems on 32<sup>nd</sup> based on the I-29 Study, which gives a strong indication that the resolution is going to have to be an interchange, but the study is actually going to be for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, with, again, the likely outcome that we will end of having to do an off-system improvement for the 47<sup>th</sup> Interchange, so they aren't applying for the interchange with the NEPA, and this might be a play on words, but it is actually a study for 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, that is his understanding with discussions with the State, and that is why it is using regional dollars because 32<sup>nd</sup> is on the regional system, but the 47<sup>th</sup> Interchange is not on any classified street system. Haugen added that he knows the Mr. Kuharenko is reworking. Grasser agreed, and said that he would talk to him about that and make sure that he gets it titled correctly. He added that they are presuming the conclusion, but the document is actually not studying the conclusion, it is still studying the problem. Haugen commented that they are just noting that, with the new Land Use Plan, there has been some shifting in how the City is forecasting its housing and employment, and they are now showing that 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue will have roughly 20% less traffic in 2045 than we were forecasting in 2030.

Grasser said that he thinks part of the issue is that we have growth growing basically right up to the boundary at this point in time, and they need to have some level, probably of better assurance, whether an interchange is going there or not, and part of the issue is when the DOT's current idea is that they don't want any intersecting side streets within a minimum of a half mile from an interchange, so on the Grand Forks side that means, if you can envision where 34<sup>th</sup> Street is, that is technically less than a half mile itself, and the concept plan on both sides, the developers concept plan on both sides of 47<sup>th</sup> would envision, potentially, access points closer than that, basically 38 would be maybe a ¾ intersection and 34 would probably be the first signalized intersection, so, again if they are going to reroute streets to accommodate something, there is a potential DOT decision that they might not even allow a 38<sup>th</sup> Street connection to go in there, obviously that changes a lot then for the developer concept, so they kind of need to know whether they can move forward on this and under what conditions, or if we are going to put ten lanes on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South to fix the problem.

Powers asked if we need to approve this. Haugen responded that approval is needed as these are projects that are due to the NDDOT on Friday, and they need to have a decision from the MPO as to whether or not they are consistent with the plan, and also the priority owner and fiscal constraint.

Mock commented that she is a little concerned about pushing that work on Washington back two years to FY2021 when we are already getting complaints. Grasser said that he would invite anybody to drive it, they would see it right away. Haugen agreed, but added that conversely what we discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting was pushing back the other issues, another considerable number of years, and then in FY2020 all of the money is already programmed elsewhere in the State so we aren't sure there is even a fiscal ability to do a project in FY2020.

Grasser reported that part of the discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee was if we reasonably expect to be able to get those kinds of dollars for reconstruction in that timeline; the DOT rep strongly suspected that we would not being we are getting programming in for the bridge and that part of the underpass, that is a pretty big ticket item, and if we fail to get the money what will we do with Washington Street, we need to do something with it, FY2020 is too far out, really. He stated that, philosophically, at the Technical Advisory Committee, and we should have maybe more discussion on

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

this than just today, but to simplify the discussion; five years ago, when we created this we created a list of projects, and the question today is, are we following the list or are we reacting to changes in conditions, understanding that the intent of the document is state of good repair to keep your system running; and in FY2018 the system managers feel that given the existing conditions, and the current financial constraints as opposed to the long-term financial constraints, means that our best tactic is to do the mill and overlay. He added that the mill and overlay also goes beyond what the reconstruction piece was; and if he remembers correctly that would have been from Hammerling to 8<sup>th</sup> Ave, and accepting that piece at the intersection of DeMers and Washington, it would have been two separate projects, the mill and overlay addresses both those pieces, with the idea that that is going to buy us some times, again pursuing the concept that we would look at a reconstruction in that FY2030 timeline, or less. He said that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting we felt that outside of the list of the projects, the Long Range Transportation Plan, we are meeting the goals and we are meeting the financial constraints, basically, at least at this point in time, so that was the guidance that we had on the regional side from the District Engineer, and that is what the City Council approved.

Haugen stated that you have the two options for a motion; you can agree with what the MPO Staff is recommending, or you can agree with what the Technical Advisory Committee is recommending. He said that with the staff recommendation we have a lot of projects that would be forwarded without favorable review, and with the Technical Advisory Committee recommendation you would have projects being submitted with favorable review.

Haugen reported that we are in this transition period where we are at the end of a five year cycle, about to, at the end of this year, adopt a new transportation plan of new projects, so we are at an odd time in our plan as well, it is toward the end of the life of the plan, and that is just where we are at whenever we have to do it every five years, there is this programming out four years out, and identifying things that are past the five year cycle of the plan.

Grasser commented that he thinks part of the complications on the financial constraint, if he remembers right, on the Long Range Transportation Plan, when we did the Kennedy and the Sorlie we didn't know what year, and such, and both those projects came through here in the very recent past, and the Kennedy we are still working on, so, again, there were a lot of dollars expended, and if you look at the State of North Dakota, the City of Grand Forks, it is a spot on the map, so now it gets down to how many dollars we can expect to get. He said that he thinks they are inferring that we might have gotten, we've gotten a substantial share of the state resources in the recent past, so we might have to take a breather, and, again, these are all decisions that would be going on in Bismarck, and whatnot. He added that when you look at the dollars it seems like the most reasonable effort might be to get the mill and overlay on there, and get it back up and running, and then figure out how to fix it in FY2020, and then start planning for the reconstruction.

Vetter said that, if he understands correctly, both Staff and Technical Advisory Committee agree with these projects, it is just whether are consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan or not. Haugen responded that they can't disagree that the pavement on South Washington is poor, it is just that we had identified that we weren't going to just address the pavement on South Washington, we were going to invest in a full fix once we had the two bridges done and the underpass program, our next big project was the reconstruction of that South Washington Street.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Powers asked is this would be similar to what was done on DeMers last summer. Grasser responded that he thinks this project would be more extensive than what was done on DeMers because right now the concept of reconstructing DeMers we don't need any property, and one of the things that really worries him about South Washington, some of the problems that we need to fix, we've got street lights in the middle of sidewalks and we have driveways and accesses very close together, and offset, and those types of things, in his mind he translates that into time and money because we need to work with property owners, we need to acquire property, we need to negotiate, and those are all very time consuming type issues, and expensive type issues, because there is no place to move a light, if you move it out of the sidewalk you are moving it onto somebody's property so part of the concern is, the dollar amount is really what is driving it, but he thinks in his mind, time. He added that the DOT, we are putting pressure on them to get DeMers Avenue done in FY2019, but it sounds like it might slip to FY2020 if we do reconstruction, and then we are putting pressure on them to get going on the underpass, so again how many of these things can the DOT crank out and if we make this request and it gets delayed or taken off the list, now what do we do, now we, as the MPO, are sitting there saying "Washington, we gave it a shot but it didn't work out", and he wants to make sure we can defend that we implemented a strategy that we think is successful; he thinks there is a substantial likelihood of failure if we go through the reconstruction because of the discussion of the cash flow of dollars, and we are going to have a riot if that street doesn't have a good solid plan in place.

DeMers asked, with the mill and overlay, would you be looking at 15 years before you would have to address structural changes to South Washington. Grasser responded that Mr. Noehre has been looking at a ten year cycle on his, because we might use 20 years on a local street, but on a street like Washington the life isn't going to be there. DeMers asked if you would seal coat it then in ten years, he was thinking seven to ten years and then you would seal coat it and then another seven to ten before you would look at redoing the surface in its entirety. Grasser responded that on Washington, specifically, would be mill and overlay in FY2020, and then around FY2030 we would still be trying to hard program the full reconstruction.

Discussion ensued.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FY2019-2022 URBAN LOCAL AND URBAN REGIONAL CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: Malm.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL TO ADOPT SAFETY TARGETS**

Haugen reported that this is the time when we need to make a decision if we are going to adopt the Safety Targets that each State has adopted, or if we are going to adopt targets that are specific to the MPO area. He said that they have been keeping this body as informed, as best they can, as to what the State's five targets are.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Haugen referred to the staff report, and pointed out that included in the staff report is the action that the Technical Advisory Committee took, and that is to recommend the local targets. He added that the support materials still lists what each State has adopted as their targets, so that is where we are at and both the Staff and Technical Advisory Committee are recommending the adoption of the safety targets that are on this list.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE ADOPTION OF THE MPO SAFETY PERFORMANCE TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

Haugen commented that these are annual targets, so we will have to address these, if not before, twelve months from now.

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

Haugen reported that there are three things that we will touch on, probably spending more time on the third item, but we did have a public meeting last December, and we did have a financial survey that we asked people to take part in. He said that we received about 70 responses to that survey.

Haugen stated that we also have had goals and objectives out for comment, and have asked for our local staff and state and federal staff to review and provide their comments. He said that the timeframe for those comments has expired so what is included in the packet are the draft goals and objectives and standards that are being proposed for public comment.

Haugen said that the last thing is that tomorrow night we will be holding a Joint Future Bridge Location meeting with both City Councils, County Commissioners, the Technical Advisory Committee, and others to go over the analysis that was done on the four additional river crossings; and, again, this is just reviewing them from the impact our travel demand model forecast will have on the traffic.

Haugen commented that in our 2045 Plan our model is showing that the three river crossings are going to have a Level of Service F or worse traffic conditions on them, and if we do nothing we will have some intersections that will be failing operational service, missing several cycles of green to get through them, so we looked at four possible crossings; 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and Merrifield. He stated that each of these locations has a stand-alone additional bridge.

Haugen reported that included in the packet are the volumes, how they change key intersections in and around, plus the traffic beyond the bridge itself. He pointed out that as we go further south we have less local traffic crossing the bridge. He added that all four of these bridges are going to take traffic off of U.S. #2 and #220, on the east end of our metro area; because of the more direct line than either going through the congested Sorlie Bridge or Kennedy Bridge, so all four of these bridges have regional traffic, the difference between them is the type of local traffic being attracted to them.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

Haugen referred to tables, and explained that they give us some sense of how these locations will affect the traffic flow. He went over each briefly, pointing out that it does show that the further south we go, fewer cars are diverted. He added that the bottom table gives us a sense of the plus/minus that is occurring, and, for him, it gives some sense that, again, all of these crossings are going to attract some regional traffic, or traffic that is out on U.S. #2 and #220, but which ones are impacting the local traffic and from we have been hearing is that that is what we need to be looking at, so it seems that the further north we go, the better it performs in that regard.

Haugen reported that all four of these locations impact the Washington corridor, so we are sort of having some shift of the problems on the Point corridor, 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Bygland Road, to having a spot problem at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Washington in particular.

Haugen commented that there is some other information that we will get into with the next level of analysis, and that will be benefit/cost and cost and effectiveness.

Haugen said that what they are trying to get a sense of is, if we want to go to the next level of analysis for these, are there some that we can drop and not spend money on because we can see from the traffic side that they aren't doing what we hope a new bridge would do. He added that if we are going forward with more work on the bridges, it would be looking at the benefit/cost ratios, looking at the touchdown points on both sides of the river, what intersections we may have to address, whether they are penetrating the flood protection system or if they are high and dry; so a lot more work will need to be done if you want to move forward, but we are trying to reduce that amount of work to maybe not all four of these locations.

Vetter stated that he won't be at the meeting tomorrow night, but he would like to say that his preference would be to study the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and the Merrifield Road locations. He added that he feels that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is just too far south and won't move enough traffic off Bygland and Rhinehart, and while the study says that 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue will move a lot of traffic off of Bygland and Rhinehart, he thinks it impacts the residential side more than the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue location; so, again, his preference would be to keep the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and the Merrifield Road locations in the study. He explained that if you go with 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue you will have the residential impact plus you will impact Washington from 24<sup>th</sup> down to 32<sup>nd</sup>, but if you go with 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue you still have the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue issue, but you take Washington Street off of it.

Vetter commented that he doesn't think you will see any more traffic on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue with a bridge than you do now, not significantly because the traffic is already going that way anyway, and you are going to take it off of Washington and put it on 32<sup>nd</sup>, and you will take it off of Belmont and Reeves Drive and put it on 32<sup>nd</sup>, so he doesn't think there will be much of an impact, the only impact will be from Belmont to the new bridge, that main road will have the biggest impact, less vehicles will be going that way.

**MATTER OF FUTURE NON-MOTORIZED BRIDGE BETWEEN DOWNTOWNS**

Haugen reported that since the Kennedy Bridge Project discussion, the MPO Board has been keenly interested in a separate bike/ped bridge between the Kennedy and the Sorlie, crossing the Red River. He said that, as mentioned back then, we did do a study when the flood protection system was still under

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

design, and the recreational feature of additional bike/ped bridges were being scoped out, he included the pertinent pages from that study in the packet.

Haugen stated that they looked at four total bridges, two of them have been built, the third was a bridge on the Red Lake River that was dropped, and the fourth one was a downtown bridge. He said that this was all based on the assumed flood protection design criteria, so the results are based on assumed data, so if you wanted, we could amend this into the work program to revisit the location. He added that at that time we were looking at utilizing the center pier that stands there today, but we could update the scope if you wanted the study to include additional crossing locations between the Kennedy and the Sorlie, but the biggest obstacle would be that we would be introducing new obstructions into the floodway instead of utilizing the obstruction that is there.

Powers asked, if we use the old pier from the old Northern Pacific Bridge, that would still impact the flood plain by half a foot, correct. Haugen responded that these are, again, the assumed impacts based on the assumption of what the flood flow and hydraulic analysis were assuming at that time during the whole design of the flood protection system. He said, though, that if we do a new study we would take actual data instead of assumed data, so it could be somewhat different.

Grasser stated that some part of the challenge of the bridges has been how do you get your touchdown points to be compatible, so if we are going to look at a bridge we should try to look at how that really configures because if you are high it takes a long time to get back down, and the same with low, so how might that work out; and the other thing he is wondering about is that our best available information right now, for flooding, is based on the Fargo/Moorhead period of flow, so are we going to be analyzing using that data. He added that even the wet weather flow, when they talked to FEMA, and he is trying to paraphrase some of the discussion when the Governors met, is that when FEMA comes back at some point in time, they are going to develop their own period of record, and they have a fair idea of what it might be, but they are going to use whatever the best data is. He said that he thinks the only thing we know for sure is that those flows keep going up, and he doesn't know how their new period of record might match with the wet period of record, but he knows that either one of those is different than what was used here. Powers asked if that wasn't the mentality that Fargo is using right now, to kind of wait and see what FEMA says. He added that Fargo is struggling with this because the conundrum they are in is, Minnesota DNR primarily wants to design for the 100 year flood, and Fargo, based on what FEMA told them, is fairly sure that the next FEMA review the 100 year flood is going to be higher than what we are looking at now, so they can spend \$2 billion dollars and then find out that they can't be certified because the new flows are higher than the old flows and that is why Fargo needs to have a project higher than the current 100 year flood to have some assurance that it isn't going to be out of date before it is even completed.

Powers commented that what Fargo does will impact this. Grasser agreed, adding that Fargo's flood protection project definitely has an impact up here. He said that they did a very rigorous analysis to make sure that the elevation of the 100 year flood didn't change, and he doesn't want to blow your mind but after you accept the fact that the 100 year flood goes up a foot from where we are at today, there is no change from the Fargo project because they are saying that the new hydrology basically raises our old 100 year flood by a foot, but what impacts us is as they are moving that water north earlier and longer, our bridges may be under water more often and longer at the 50 year and 25 year events, so the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, February 21<sup>st</sup>, 2018**

regulatory piece, remember is only that one single point, that 100 year event, or a curve, so we there are impacts there.

Haugen stated that we are looking for direction, whether or not you want us to pursue this as a work activity this year or not, and prepare the document. He said that, based on your last discussion you wanted to try to work with both State DOTs on siting and reaching an agreement on another bike/ped bridge between the Kennedy and the Sorlie, and you exchanged letters to that effect with both States.

Powers commented that, personally, he thinks that a different location other than the old railroad bridge is going to be very spendy, so he would just as soon utilize the pier, although we may need to make it smaller so it doesn't impact the river so much. Vetter said that he could see a fourth option of utilizing the pier as it was originally intended and swing the bridge so it is perpendicular to the river during a flood event. Powers agreed, adding that it is there.

Grasser asked if it would be possible to look at these three elevations and see how the timing would go, and maybe if there is an option for turning the bridge, before getting into the hydraulics because the hydraulics and flood flow is going to just be a mess, and he is just wondering if we can at least figure out if there is an alignment that makes all the touchdown points work, and maybe just split that workload up a little bit to move it forward.

DeMers asked what the timeframe of potential funding for a project like this would be. Haugen responded that that is not known. He added that, you remember how this was brought forward, there was a strong desire not to have the current bike/ped accommodation be put on the Kennedy, and there was some discussion that if we were to get a separate bike/ped bridge, perhaps we could repurpose that space on the Kennedy back to vehicles. He added that he doesn't know how much you want to repurpose that space on the Kennedy, how much each State wants to repurpose that space. DeMers stated that he asks this because we have a couple of other bridge projects we are looking at, and he doesn't see either State having any money so he doesn't know why we are going to try to program something that isn't going to happen, so I guess we will see what happens with the Kennedy, but he isn't too fired up about putting two bridges down there right now, that isn't where his focus is.

Malm stated that he thinks you need to leave this off for a year and see what happens with the Kennedy, it may be a disaster for bike traffic, so we need to get an idea of how it is going to operate, and if it can handle it, and he doesn't think it will, then we won't have to do anything, but he doesn't think we should do anything until we know.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE TABLING THIS ITEM UNTIL ONE YEAR AFTER THE KENNEDY BRIDGE PROJECT IS COMPLETED, THEN REVISIT IT TO SEE IF IT SHOULD BE PURSUED AT THAT TIME.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**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 1/13/18 to 2/16/18 Period

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2017,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:25 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
SPECIAL JOINT FUTURE BRIDGE LOCATINOS MEETING  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 – 5:30 P.M.  
Grand Forks County Office Building – 6<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 5:39 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent were: Al Grasser, Marc DeMers, and Mike Powers.

Guests Present were: (See Sign-In Sheet In File)

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**INTRODUCTIONS**

Vein asked that everyone present please state their name and the organization they represent.

**MATTER OF PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS OF TRAFFIC ANALYSIS OF  
POTENTIAL FUTURE BRIDGE CROSSINGS OF THE RED RIVER**

Haugen reported that last December we had another joint meeting to talk about if we should look at additional river crossing locations, and if we do how many should we look at. He stated that the results were that we would look at four locations and, per the MPO Board's request, we would do a traffic impact analysis of those four locations, and Mr. Bourdon, who is our project manager with Kimley-Horn, is here to present those findings, which were distributed electronically to everyone prior to this meeting. He commented that this is being done at the same time that the MPO is updating its Street and Highway Element of its Long Range Transportation Plan, so we do have a lot of other transportation and street issues that we are looking at, but this meeting is just focusing on these potential future river crossing sites and what the traffic volume changes are forecasted to be if one is placed.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that with this, at the end of the meeting, our hope is that if we are going to move forward, we would do so with fewer than four additional bridge crossings if possible because the next steps would entail more costly analyses of each individual site, so this first step was not as costly as the next step would be if we are actually going to pursue these four sites.

Brandon Bourdon, Kimley-Horn, stated that he will give a really brief overview of where they are at in the overall planning process; obviously the focus is to talk a little about this traffic related river crossing analysis, and we will talk a little about the next steps at the end as well.

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

Bourdon commented that they started working on updating the Street/Highway Element of the Long Range Transportation Plan back in the summer of 2017. He stated that they have done a good job of working through existing conditions and are now moving through and are part way through the process of establishing some goals and performance measures; and that process will continue.

Bourdon said that, based on your existing conditions and input from the public, and looking at some of data we are beginning to work through the process of identifying issues and looking at what particular transportation improvements should be investigated further.

Bourdon commented that the next Public Meeting will be held in April; and they are going to present more of the performance measures to the public, and talk more about some of these issues where ultimately we need to have a pretty good draft wrapped up in the summer so that we can get the draft out to the public of what is going to be in this plan, and then there is certainly a process of getting input from a variety of entities prior to final adoption which will occur more toward the end of the year.

Bourdon stated that he will talk a little bit about what we were focused on, and as Mr. Haugen mentioned, we focused on really looking at what would happen, in terms of more of a traffic volume and traffic operation standpoint on a planning level if we looked at various river crossing locations. He said that they then looked at four locations, and they really wanted to look at how things would be impacted from the local traffic and connectivity standpoint. He stated that they did end up basing their analysis using the Travel Demand Model, and A.T.A.C. has been doing runs, so that is a tool where they can look at each of the crossings, put them into the model, and then we can see where the traffic is anticipated to move throughout the roadway network.

Bourdon said that, again, areas of review they were looking at what happened at the existing crossings, was traffic moving to some of the other four, so they looked individually at the following locations: 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue So., 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue So., 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue So., and Merrifield Road. He explained that they would put in a bridge crossing, run the model, and see what happened; then they would pull that one and add another one so they could get one variable to see how traffic shifted and the impacts.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Bourdon commented that they were looking at some of what happened more from a neighborhood perspective, but also as more of a regional and local roadway perspective to kind of get a comparison of the various metrics, based on each of the crossings.

Bourdon stated that these are just kind of, what did we assume, as part of this modeling we looked at, and they basically assumed that any of the new river crossings would be a two-lane bridge, so they didn't do anything and assume that it was going to be a four-lane bridge; they assumed that we are going to be connecting it at each end with two-lane roads, and they did add a bunch of additional through-lane capacity at either end, and they did not make any new connections at I-29 or at U.S. 2 to the east, so they didn't add any connections, so that is just some of the ground rules of what the modeling assumptions were, but they were all the same for each of the scenarios.

Vein commented, like 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue would have been the potential for a ramp. Bourdon responded that, yes, that would have been one of them where ultimately there could be an interchange. Vein stated that one of the issues they have had, at least on the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Corridor, is that we know that there is congestion there, right, and that the future is, to relieve that congestion, is to build an off-ramp on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding though that is probably some long-term future project.

Haugen stated that all three of the interchanges in town have congestion issues today, and in the future they won't get better, they will get worse. Vein agreed, adding, though that he doesn't know how best to handle that because, we are talking about that, and obviously we don't know, but there would be impacts with 47<sup>th</sup> because that probably is an interchange that they would be pursuing. Haugen said, though, that there are two things going on, and that is why they didn't model any new interchanges or any new connections to U.S. #2 on the eastside; and that is because the focus we were told to look at is on local traffic, and so as we make those connections and we are starting to include regional traffic, if you will, into the analysis, and we were told the focus was going to be on local traffic.

Haugen said that another reason is that the I-29 Study showed, and even this model run shows, that the bridge is connected to the Interstate Interchanges, and the model isn't showing a strong correlation between those, the model is really showing that these bridges are really only impacting Washington Street and Bygland Road, and once you get beyond those there is less of an impact, and when you get to the Interchange it is hard to decipher whether it is causing more traffic at the I-29 area or less, it is pretty neutral at that point.

Haugen stated that, for those two reasons, with the major reason being that we were told that this was going to be a bridge for local traffic. Vein said that he would agree with that, but the implications are beyond that no matter if it is a bridge for local traffic or not, it is going to impact those others. He added that the Merrifield Road is another one where you didn't include ramps, but again that would be a foreseeable thing to have happen too, so those are two things that he questions. Haugen commented that we would introduce those if we narrowed down the bridge locations to what seems to be the ones that are really being pursued, and analyze further, then as part of a group of projects we would include those interchanges and see how they affect the whole network.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Bourdon reported that some of this, based on the local nature, is you get so many different variables doing just kind of high level streaming; and some of the thought is, let's get some input based on only looking at these scenarios, and if the input is received, if you have a few less variable in there, you get a more in-depth analysis, so as Mr. Haugen said, we certainly can dive into some more stuff moving forward. Vein commented that you've got what you've got, so he is just bringing this forward as issues.

Bourdon referred to the presentation, and explained that the next few slides basically show some of the key intersections they looked at in the region, and the overall intersection level of service, which has a rating of A-F. He pointed out that it goes from top to bottom so when you look at the top one it shows the existing level of service, and then the next is the no-build level of service, and then we go from crossings from the north all the way to the south, with the Merrifield Road scenario at the bottom.

Bourdon stated that a couple of key take-a-ways, when we kind of look and compare the intersection operations at a global level, is that over at Belmont and 4<sup>th</sup> there is certainly deterioration where we go from a Level Of Service F under no action, then we improve at any of the river crossings of 24<sup>th</sup>, 32<sup>nd</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> to a Level Of Service C, and then there is the river crossing at Merrifield where it deteriorates back to a Level Of Service F.

Bourdon reported that at Washington and 32<sup>nd</sup> we start with a Level Of Service D today, under the no action, we would anticipate traffic will go up so that deteriorates to a Level Of Service E; and for the rest there is Level Of Service F, with the 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> crossing, but there is some improvement as you do the 47<sup>th</sup> and the Merrifield Road crossings with Level Of Service E, so we don't go from a Level Of Service F to a Level Of Service A at that location, but there are some subtle differences.

Bourdon commented, that as we look at more of a Link Level Of Service; and we are going to look at some diagrams, there are a few take-a-ways that he will try to identify as we go through the graphics, but one thing they did notice was that the Point Bridge operates generally better under the 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South crossings, so a little less traffic is drawn from the north as you move further south with the crossings, so there is a little less improvement of operation on the Point Bridge.

Bourdon stated that there is some improvement on Gateway Drive under all the crossings scenarios except when just looking at the Merrifield Road crossing by it-self because it is, again, too far south.

Bourdon said that in regard to Washington Street, he isn't saying that, necessarily, things have great operating conditions, Level of Service A and B, but there are some improvements when we look at the 32<sup>nd</sup> or 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossings. He added that you will see under the other scenarios that there is a little more poor level of service, and then Belmont Road operates generally better under all crossing scenarios.

Bourdon commented that the next scenario shows on the left, what the Link Level Of Service are under the existing base model, and on the right it shows what the no build Link Level Of Service is; so this is basically saying that "based on existing conditions, compared to future no-build

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

network with traffic growth and some impacts of that growth, there is generally going to be some deterioration, particularly on the roadways that already have capacity issues”.

Bourdon stated that a couple of other things to note is that as you look at the Gateway Drive or U.S. #2 crossing, that is operating at a Level Of Service E under no action conditions; and if you start looking at the Point Bridge crossing that is more at a Level Of Service E as well, so you are going to have some poor operation on those two links. He added that there is a Level Of Service C on Belmont to the south and a Level Of Service B to the north, so as we go through this he will try to identify some of those points that changed from before.

Bourdon referred to the presentation, and reported that he will now go through each river crossing separately. He pointed out that on the right there is going to be a map that shows the daily volumes, and they kind of compare the existing average daily traffic at the top with the 2045 no build, and then the forecast traffic for that scenario so you can kind of compare what would it be under no build versus what would happen at this particular river crossing scenario.

Bourdon went over the different scenarios briefly.

Vein commented that it appears that 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> are very similar. Bourdon responded that when we look at some of these crossings, as we start looking at volumes and adding them up, there are some pretty subtle differences, but there are some night and day differences as well as some similarities.

Bourdon said that, just to kind of generalize this, the Level Of Service is improved at the Point Bridge with the 24<sup>th</sup>, 32<sup>nd</sup>, and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing alternatives. He added that Washington Street tends to operate better under the 32<sup>nd</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing alternatives. He stated that Belmont looks better under all of the scenarios.

Bourdon reported that the ADTs on Bygland Road, north of Rhinehart, decreased more if the 24<sup>th</sup> or 32<sup>nd</sup> crossings were selected. He pointed out that you can also see that there is a little bit more traffic, and less of a decrease, with the 47<sup>th</sup> and Merrifield crossings. He added that in looking at the Trunk Highway 220 river crossing, basically the ADTs will be highest if you look at the 32<sup>nd</sup> or the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossings are selected.

Haugen summarized that what this is telling him is, again, getting back at, is the focus local; so which of the bridges are taking the most local traffic away, and that would be shown by that one point on Bygland Road, north of Rhinehart; and the other point is the Mallory Bridge, how it changes with each river crossing, it always attracts more traffic, so as you go further south that kind of ratio of the traffic over the new bridge, how much of that is regional traffic versus local traffic, and that is what the one table is trying to get at. He pointed out that at the very bottom the Mallory River Crossing, or Trunk Highway 220, the ratio of that versus the traffic change at Bygland Road, it starts to flip as soon as you get past 24<sup>th</sup>.

Bourdon commented that the first table really just summarizes the Link Level Of Service at the actual crossing locations, and so, similar to what was said before, but in one location where it is easy to see, we have the no-build for Gateway and U.S. 2 at E; and then there is improvement with the 24<sup>th</sup>, 32<sup>nd</sup>, and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossings and deterioration with the Merrifield crossing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Bourdon stated that there is an improvement that is always going to operate under all these scenarios at a Level of Service F; and then the Point Bridge generally improves the most under the 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue crossings, improving from an E to a B, and there is also improvement at 47<sup>th</sup> and less with the Merrifield Crossing at a Level Of Service D.

Bourdon reported that what they did next was to look a bit at where there are some increases based on the type of traffic, so they lowered the vehicle miles traveled on the lower functional classes; which are defined more as you minor arterials, collectors, and local streets, and then asked how they impacted the traffic on the higher functional classes; which are your principal arterials, your freeway ramps and your freeways. He referred to a table and pointed out that some of these scenarios pop out a little bit.

Bourdon commented that with the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing, there is going to be some slight increases to the lower functional class, so there is about a 199 extra vehicle miles traveled under that; but you see that there will be the greatest reduction in the higher functional class VMTs.

Bourdon pointed out that if you look at 24<sup>th</sup>, and the reduction, you will see the total reduction of miles on the freeway, ramps, and major arterials; so here, when we say it's the most, it is a general reduction of about 24,000 vehicle miles traveled. He added, though, that you will see that there is a slight increase in the local miles traveled of roughly 199 miles, so if you look at the table, the higher functional class roadway has the greatest reduction, and there is a slight increase of roughly 199 miles with that scenario, just looking at this network wide.

Bourdon stated that, working backward, the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing reduces vehicle hours traveled the most of any alternative; so that is basically how long are you going to sit in the car, and that is one of these fun metrics that the travel demand model throws out. He said that, the 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing, looking at the bottom and the total reduction of vehicle hours traveled, it basically is a reduction of a little over 1,000 vehicle hours traveled, and the other scenarios vary from a reduction of 800 to an increase of 174 for the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing. Haugen commented that these numbers are the numbers that you would use, typically in the rudimentary benefit/cost analysis, so the more negative numbers of reduction the more benefit you are getting from that structure. Bourdon added that that is where you can assign a variety of user costs for workers and people going to and from work, and kind of put some of those other factors in there as to how it impacts the traveling public as a whole.

Bourdon said that the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue crossing is anticipated as having the second greatest reduction in vehicle miles traveled, so as previously discussed, it shows a reduction that is relatively similar to 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and as mentioned before the 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue crossings are pretty similar, within about a reduction of 300 miles. He added that 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue also has the greatest lower functional class reduction, so on the lower functional class reduction the reduction is 1,300 vehicles, so that is almost the second greatest reduction where the Merrifield would reduce things by 4,200 vehicles miles traveled.

Bourdon commented that the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue crossing will end up having the lowest vehicle mile reduction of 13,491; so on the high end we were talking roughly 23,000, over here it is around 13,000, so that is kind of similar to 47<sup>th</sup> and Merrifield Road crossings, they are relatively

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

similar. He added that it does have the largest lower functional class vehicle mile traveled increase, so if you kind of look at what happens on the minor streets on the bottom of the table, you will see that we go from where we have some reduction in vehicle miles traveled on the local, this would be more of an increase of 700 miles, so it is the highest increase.

Bourdon stated that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is the only scenario that would increase the vehicle miles traveled; the others on the bottom table all see some reduction, varying between a reduction of 1,000 to roughly 675, this would be an increase of about 174 vehicle hours traveled.

Bourdon commented that, in talking a little about the Merrifield Road crossing scenario; the lower functional vehicle miles traveled, under that scenario, would be reduced the most, so that is a reduction of roughly 4,200 vehicle miles traveled, so you can see it is reducing some of the travel on the local roadway network. He added that on a regional level it reduces that travel on major arterials the least, so it is a reduction of roughly 13,500 compared to some of the others we talked about that are quite a bit more.

Vetter referred to Merrifield Road crossing, and asked if on Merrifield Road, with the increase of just over 4,000, does that mean that regional traffic isn't coming through town, it is bypassing the City altogether. Haugen responded that it is implying that. He added that when we use the label "local" you have to remember that most of the county highways are considered local in the model, so it is really addressing that rural/county commute into and of the town, but it is local in the fact that it is lower functional class, they are all local major collectors.

Haugen referred to the table and pointed out that you will see the Mallory Bridge volumes that are changed by Merrifield, versus all the rest of them, it is low; but then when you look at the local traffic volumes it is three times regional than local traffic crossing Merrifield.

Bourdon reported that the next slide is next steps. He stated that the focus has been stated, as they said before, to focus more on kind of the "local" traffic aspects; and they are now wondering of some of the locations be dropped, based on input, from further analysis, like Mr. Haugen said, just because the analysis gets a little more arduous, so if there are some that don't make sense, maybe we don't have to analyze them for the sake of analyzing them.

Bourdon stated that if some locations remain, then the next steps would be for us to go through and exercise and do some timing levels and getting cost estimate, because that would tie into the planning process, as to how the crossings compare, and there certainly would be more focus on what do things near the crossing look like from some key intersection geometry, similar to the south at Merrifield, we have gotten quite a bit of work done so we don't necessarily have to invent the wheel, but at some of the other locations before we can move forward there is probably some review needed just to see how things would touch down and how some of the intersections may be impacted.

Haugen commented that we are just trying to make sure that we are looking at, really, river crossings in more detail that are serving the purpose you are asking us to look into, and so far you have been saying focus on the local traffic, and it seems like the further south you go the less local traffic it is serving, so should we continue to look at them to try to be the bridge that serves local traffic.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that when we talk about the whole benefit/cost thing, we do have one location that has a positive number for the local lower functional class; but it also has a positive number for the vehicle hours traveled, that is 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He added that, with a glance at what benefit/cost would be it would be tough to show that that has a ratio of one or better, even though the miles traveled overall is 15,000, the hours traveled is a positive so the benefit /cost is going to be tough, and it is almost half of what 32<sup>nd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> are for miles traveled.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Malm stated that we have done this for years, we've talked, and somebody has got to make a decision where you want to do it, because then you have to cure all the rest of the problems when you make that decision; and there are lots of problems that we aren't talking about here.

Malm said that he was here when Mrs. Strand said that she would not let her children walk across the street, well those children have grandchildren now, that is how long we've been at this; what's the future, we are a planning organization, how do we plan to the future, what's in the plans for Grand Forks and East Grand Forks dealing with growth, those are the kinds of things we never get through until we pick up a location, and then we get all the rumbles that come with it.

Vein responded that there is a technical solution and then there is a political solution. Malm said, though, that the technical solution is to choose the location, and then you people on the City Councils that have to deal with the political ramifications. Vein agreed, adding that he thinks the idea was to have the right amount of data available when you make a decision to be able to understand that decision. Malm commented that you can put all the data in the world in until you affect people, and people know how they are going to get affected. He added that all he is saying is that he doesn't know how we are going to make any decisions here, who is going to make that decision.

Malm reported that the Grand Forks County Engineer said that he would lead anything that deals with Merrifield Road, to try to put it all together, so he would say then that we should let that one stay in there because that would be county monies, not city monies.

Malm commented that he doesn't want to see us go through anybody's neighborhood. He said that 47<sup>th</sup> goes by schools, again, and every mother runs out into the street and screams.

Vein asked, before we added additional bridge locations, what was the original intent going to be for a bridge location in this study. Haugen responded that this was carrying forward the current locations. Vein asked what they are. Haugen responded that they are 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave and Merrifield. Vein said, then, that 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and Merrifield were going to be the original locations had we not had the recommendation to add originally three more locations, then it was down to the two locations of 24<sup>th</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield have been the two future river sites since roughly 2001, and we update this plan every five years, and they have been adopted three times, and since we haven't been informed otherwise, we assumed that we would just be carrying them again.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Vetter asked if, based on the data, can we agree that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue should probably be dropped for the remainder of this study. Vein responded that he wishes there were more city council members present because he is a little concerned about making that decision since the President of the Grand Forks City Council was the one that originally proposed we add more bridges to the study.

Vein commented that the intent, if he is correct, was to try to reduce this so we can save study costs, otherwise there is no problem with continuing to study all four locations. Haugen responded that there isn't, so if you tell us to study them we will do so. Vein asked if that wasn't the original intent, to study all four of them, and you asked us to scale back. Haugen responded that he thinks the original intent was to try to start with as few as possible, and as the deliberation in December ensued, it was decided that we would only look at 32<sup>nd</sup> and north, and then in the end 47<sup>th</sup> and Merrifield came in when the larger group met, and then when the MPO Executive Policy Board met to finalize the scope of work there was originally talk of just looking at 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave and Merrifield, and then the Board dropped 17<sup>th</sup> and left 24<sup>th</sup> and 47<sup>th</sup> to be included with 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield. Haugen said that we said we would go as far as looking at them from this traffic point of view to see if any of the four crossings didn't perform as well as the others, for that local traffic. He added that he thinks that that is kind of suggesting that for local traffic the two southern crossings just aren't really performing well for the cost that remains for siting them for local traffic, so from a staff point of view, why would we try to push those even further when the data is already suggesting that they aren't good candidates for local traffic.

Sanders stated that Merrifield would be more of a regional functioning bridge. He added that they have always stated that we want to have hazardous and wide-loads and such by-pass Downtown Grand Forks, so we would try to get Merrifield built with an interchange on Interstate 29, and that would function as a Trunk Highway 2 By-Pass, basically; so we know what its function is, and then you start looking at 47<sup>th</sup>, 32<sup>nd</sup>, and 24<sup>th</sup> Avenues as just more of a local function between East Grand Forks and Grand Forks, it isn't going to be a by-pass bridge. Haugen agreed, adding that it has been stated it would perform like the Point Bridge performs. Sanders said, then, that you just have to pick the best location for that type of function.

Strandell commented that, from a realistic standpoint, if you want to project when a new bridge would be in place you would probably be looking at ten years, between the fund raising effort that is going to have to occur, design and construction, it will be probably ten years out before you have something in place. Vein said that it is longer than that that we are planning for. Haugen responded that he thinks what Mr. Strandell is saying is that if we decided today to get started on planning for a bridge, as quickly as we can get it, it would be at least a ten year process.

Strandell stated that another thing we haven't talked about, and probably won't at this group, is funding. He said that he has heard the cost for a two lane bridge would be about \$25 million and \$50 million if you want a high and dry bridge; where are we going to find that much money, he doesn't think it will be very easy at all, so that ten years is a probably a minimum, so we should be thinking, then, as to what kind of development is going to happen; residential, commercial, whatever, in this area and how all of that will fit into the picture.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Vein asked, when you looked at this you looked at future traffic volumes, what year did you look at. Haugen responded that 2045 is our future year estimate. Vein said, then, that you are using 2045 as the design and projected traffic to justify your numbers that are in here, and you assumed a certain amount of growth during that time. Haugen responded that they did; he added that they worked with both cities, primarily to update their land use plans and to identify, not just what type of growth, but also to get an indication of how many employees would be in an area, how many homes would be in an area, so that when we say 2045 volumes we utilized the greatest and latest land use assumptions both cities are giving us.

Bourdon reported that all of the information we receive from both cities is fed into the model to then generate what the volumes are so you get the best forecast, which could vary on the outskirts versus downtown versus a really growth area, so individual growth rates will vary, but this is all based on our best forecast assumptions in 2045, and those were the numbers that were all compared side-by-side.

Vein commented that, as he recalls, in line with what you just said, the original intent was some of the concerns we had with traffic volumes on the Grand Forks side, on Belmont and Reeves, those two were the most specific, and the idea was, as he recalls, hearing what can we do to alleviate some of that internal congestion, is that right. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen stated that the Sorlie Bridge, and as your seeing in the results, we are not really changing the volumes on the Sorlie Bridge; on the Kennedy Bridge we need to do something because if we don't do something the Kennedy Bridge will start having capacity issues in the future.

Vein said, but again as he looks at this, he is trying to remember, none of those were tremendously beneficial for the Point Bridge, there was some benefit, but it wasn't like it was night and day improvements, that he recalls, is there. Bourdon referred to Page 15 of the presentation and pointed out that it shows the level of service for the scenarios with the 2045 No-Build on the left and then it goes 24<sup>th</sup>, 32<sup>nd</sup>, 47<sup>th</sup>, and Merrifield, so north to south; so on Minnesota Avenue/1<sup>st</sup> Street, the Point Bridge it is at a Level Of Service E. Vein asked what a Level Of Service E is. Bourdon responded that a Level of Service E is pretty close is not desirable, but it is better than a Level Of Service F. He pointed out that with a crossing at 24<sup>th</sup> or 32<sup>nd</sup> we get it to a Level Of Service B, so there is quite a bit of improvement because traffic is getting pulled off of that crossing because there is an alternative route available. He added that you do still get to a Level Of Service C with a 47<sup>th</sup> Ave crossing, which isn't as good, but then you go back to a Level of Service D with a Merrifield crossing.

Vein commented that the one thing that maybe does bother him a little about removing 47<sup>th</sup> Ave without looking at the impacts of the interchange at 47<sup>th</sup>. He said that he knows we are talking about local traffic, but you would have some impact on traffic if you have the interchange at 47<sup>th</sup> Ave and I-29. Haugen responded that the I-29 Study showed that the interchange impact was less than a 1,000 cars a day, with these river crossings, when we analyzed it as part of the I-29 Study. Vein asked if they included a river crossing at 47<sup>th</sup> in the I-29 Study. Haugen responded that they did not at 47<sup>th</sup>. Vein said that that is the one that he is wondering what the impact would be.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Falck pointed out that 47<sup>th</sup> is developed, but it is less developed than 24<sup>th</sup> and 32<sup>nd</sup> by a substantial margin, as far as cost and impact on neighborhoods. Malm said, though, that that is where the City is going to grow on the Grand Forks side, so we should kick all of them out and build a north by-pass, go all the way around, start at the airport and go all the way around the north end then we wouldn't have any problems. Vein stated that that was a consideration in the past. Malm agreed, adding that we didn't even talk about it.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE FORWARDING ALL FOUR LOCATIONS ON TO OUR RESPECTIVE POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS FOR THEIR REVIEW AND DECISION.***

Mock asked, we are talking about studying these further, would it be possible to get cost estimates for what it will cost to study one, two, verses all locations, to provide to those entities. Haugen responded that yes, they can do that. Vetter stated that, on the same token, this is going to be a small cost compared to the cost of whatever we do in the politics of what it is going to be. Mock said that she thinks that we need to know what we are voting on, what is the difference in cost if we cut 47<sup>th</sup> versus leaving it in when this isn't going to happen for twenty years.

Malm commented that we tried to cut some of them off before and they all came back in again, so he thinks we have done our job and now we will send it back to them and they can do their job.

Vein stated that, even though this is an official MPO Executive Policy Board meeting, he would welcome any comments that any of the other elected officials have if they want to comment on the motion that has been made.

Diedrich asked if the cost would change much from one location to another. Haugen responded that it depends on the real scope of work. He explained that doing cost estimates is not that great, it is more about touch-points; and what he means by touch-points is if we go high and dry, which means we are above the flood protection system versus can we penetrate the flood protection system, so making that analysis, since each site is different because of the lay of the land, and to come up with how they would touch down would mean that planning level engineering work would still need to be done; but that is where the variables in cost get with the more sites you have. Vein commented that, on the same token, you are not going to get that specific, you are probably going to have a range of \$25 to \$30 million or something like that, you're not going to be able to pin it down too much at this high level. Haugen responded that you have to remember on the Minnesota side, once you get south of 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, you no longer have a flood protection system, so do assume that we build everything up to the flood protected level, so there are those added issues to the study, that we would expect you to want to have answers to when we come up with these costs.

Strandell stated that he is going to have a problem with trying to build a high and dry bridge. He said that when we have a flood it is probably a two week event, why are we going to double the cost for two weeks; for two weeks we can get along without it. Vein said that he understands this on the affordability side, but that is going to be a different question than what we have before us now, which would be just locations with this motion.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Thursday, February 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Malm commented that that is what we need the political people to decide, how much money, how are they going to raise the money to do it, because he doesn't want to stick them with a huge thing, they need to make this decision, we aren't here to do that, we are a planning board and we took it to two, and then brought it back to four, and that is the plan and they can do what they want with it because that is what they'll do, they'll bring it back and they will decide at their local level. He added that he thinks we are just wasting his time, maybe the rest of you got a lot out of this, but he has heard this for twenty years, we had, in Grand Forks, the interchange at Merrifield already paid for, but everybody started screaming that it is too far south of town, so they pulled it out. He said that the property was given to them, they could have used it as their match to pay for it, so let them decide, that is what he elected you to do, Mr. Vein.

*Voting Aye: Strandell, Malm, Strandell, and Mock.*

*Voting Nay: Vetter.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Powers, Grasser, and DeMers.*

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2018,  
SPECIAL JOINT FUTURE BRIDGE LOCATION MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE  
POLICY BOARD AT 6:39 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the March 21<sup>st</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, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, Mike Powers, and Al Grasser.

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

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AERIAL IMAGERY CONTRACT**

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

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

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

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Grasser.*

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

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

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

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Grasser.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion on road conditions ensued.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser.***

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser.***

**MATTER OF FY2018 SPRING FLOOD OUTLOOK**

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

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

Information only.

**MATTER OF FY2018 BIKE MAP**

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

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

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

Viafara said that the five goals and objectives are:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Information only.

Grasser reported present.

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON BIKE/PED PLAN**

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

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

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

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

Information only.

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

a. Revenue Forecast

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b. Universe Of Projects

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

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

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

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

c. Future Bridge Study Status

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

d. PM2 and PM3 Information

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

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

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

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

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

b. NDDOT Advised To Hold On Underpass Study

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

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

c. Add Downtown Transportation Planning To FY2018 UPWP

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

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

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

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

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

Information only.

a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

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

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

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

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vetter declared a quorum was present.

**SUSPEND AGENDA**

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

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

c. Future Bridges

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion continued.

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

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

Motion with all inclusions reads as:

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

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

*Voting Nay: Strandell.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Powers and DeMers.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers and DeMers.***

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

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

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

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

**RESUME AGENDA**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Vein excused from meeting.

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

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

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

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

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.***

There was no one present for discussion.

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

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.***

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

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

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

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.***

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

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

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

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

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Grasser stated that he would prefer to wait a month.

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

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

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Powers, Vein, and DeMers.***

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

a. Universe Of Projects

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

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

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

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

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

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

Information only.

b. PM3

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

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

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

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

Information only.

d. Open House April 18<sup>th</sup>

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

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

Information only.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

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

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

- c. NDDOT March 14<sup>th</sup> Funding Symposium

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 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, and Al Grasser.

Guest(s): Brian Opsahl, Brady-Martz and Associates; and 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 APRIL 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO  
EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE APRIL 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2018,  
MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF 2017 MPO AUDIT REPORT**

Brian Opsahl, Brady-Martz, stated that they were here a few months ago to perform the audit for the MPO, and had most of it done shortly after that but had to wait for some pension information before they could finalize it.

Opsahl referred to the 2017 Audit Report (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and went over it briefly.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Opsahl explained that as they go through the audit they have different test work and different people looking at things so there is a tendency to have a few comments here and there, and the Manager's Letter is what they call a "best practices" report. He said that as he was presenting this last year he thinks this same question was brought up so they just thought it would be a good idea to suggest that, because there is a small staff in charge of the accounting, and so whenever that is the case they like to have as many people looking at things as possible, so they are recommending that the Executive Policy Board maybe approve the expenditures when they meet. He suggested that that can be just a list of the expenditures that anyone can request items be pulled from for further discussion if they desire.

Vein asked if a formal motion would be needed to approve doing something like this, or is that something that staff can just do. Haugen responded that we did discuss this last year and this body decided that a list of expenditures be included in the packet each month for review. Vein asked if Mr. Opsahl was recommending that the board take a more formal action on this. Opsahl responded that he thinks that would help. He explained that the reason they like that extra step of approval is so that they can come back and say "okay, the board approved this in the minutes", and they are looking for things like check gaps and stuff between minutes, so their recommendation would be to formally approve it.

Grasser said that your recommendation says to review invoices and we're approving the checks, and he is wondering if there is a difference in that for your accounting purposes. Opsahl responded that the idea is, and the way that this is usually put into practice is that the invoices are available if somebody wanted to pull one, but there is a listing of the vendors and the amounts, including the check numbers, and then typically we get maybe a board packet before hand so if you wanted something pulled you can have it ready for the board meeting; but there also be a listing of the vendors and the amounts.

Presentation continued.

Grasser referred to the cover letter, under significant audit findings, it says that management is responsible for the selection and use of appropriate accounting policies, and asked if that is normal. He said that he knows there are different degrees of audits, is this typical for an MPO, is this the way it is supposed to be or should we be looking at a different type. Opsahl responded that management goes through and determines which accounting policies make sense for the MPO to have, and there is no accounting policies that have been adopted here that would be any different than any other MPO that they audit, as well as most government agencies, so if you decided, for example, that you wanted to report on a cash basis or didn't want to implement a standard for some reason, you could do that but then that would be modifying this report to some degree, but he doesn't see the need to do that, he thinks the way you are presenting right now on a full accrual is the most informative to the readers of the financial statements.

Grasser commented that the reason for his question is, he has been on different boards and there are different audits, and then there are different types of audits that happened and whatnot and he just wanted to make sure we are doing the right one from an auditing standpoint. Opsahl responded that this would be considered the most comprehensive because it has the full accrual and then there are also single audits, which if you spend over \$750,000 of federal awards you are required to have another special audit within this report, but you didn't meet that threshold so you don't have any requirements for that at this time, but that could be another thing that from entity to entity might change a little bit.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO RECEIVE AND FILE THE 2017 MPO  
AUDIT REPORT, AS PRESENTED.***

Grasser stated that he is still a little uncomfortable that we don't have a finance sub-committee made up of financial people that could look at this. He added that a lot of this is still Greek to him, he has seen a lot of audits but he it is still a little Greek to him on the process. He added that if he remembers correctly, Mr. Haugen, he thinks on our communication plan we had identified a finance committee but decided not to engage it, so he just wants to mention again that he would be more comfortable with a finance committee that would review things and kind of give everything a second brush. Vein asked if this would be a committee that would meet annually, is that what you're thinking about. Grasser responded that he doesn't have a timeframe in mind of how often the committee would meet, but he thinks that they should at least review the audit. Vein said that he thinks this would be something separate from what we have in place now and would suggest we do a follow-up on it.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

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

Haugen reported that there are three items under this agenda item, and he would like to discuss the last item first as it requires action.

**Future Bridge Study Draft Scope Of Work**

Haugen commented that on Monday you received a larger scope of work due to some additional cost analysis work that the City of Grand Forks wants done. He stated that, as we discussed, we have added 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South in and also modified it to reflect the Elks Drive location as well.

Haugen stated that in the scope of work you will see that we are updating, and they presented this information last year as the type of information and graphic that we will be updating to reflect, particularly when it comes to the flood protection as built instead of what was in there. He said that the design stage is still, some of this information we eliminated or modified or broadened to make it more generic than perhaps "dumbing-down" some level of detail that might be assumed before the NEPA process that is going to have to take place. He added that they are also including those intersections that he calls the touchdown points of each river crossing so the first major north/south street would have refined traffic operations into that, and we would do the additional level of service analysis to give us some sense of what type of traffic control would be appropriate if a bridge were to go to that intersection.

Haugen said that they will also be updating the cost estimates. He reported that some of the crossings have not had a review of the cost estimates since 2003 or so, so we will be updating those cost estimates.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen reported that the scope of work is this document that is the actual scope that identifies all that will be done. He added that a couple of other things they are doing is to try to get some sense of timing of the bridge; and of course we know that 2045 our model is saying that all three of our existing bridges will have congestion, so they are going to take a look at our model timing for 2030 versus 2045 to see if there is a sense of immediacy for, or whether one more crossing would have the potential to have the relieve needed sooner than later.

Haugen commented that during the Technical Advisory Committee discussion, and others, they also talked about how the roadways that would receive the majority of the new bridge traffic, what type of condition they are in and what they might need updated to handle the additional traffic, so they added that into the scope, but it is still at the planning level analysis stage.

Haugen stated that the bulk of the work will be at the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue area because we never looked at that site in great detail. He added that they have received from the International Coalition of the Red River Basin, a LIDAR detail for the river so we have some fairly good contours in that area that will reflect similar profiles that we have for the existing conditions, and it is post flood protection construction so it shows that as well. He said that on the Minnesota side 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue there is a township roadway connection, so one of the scopes that we added in is to just flesh out better if that were the chosen side what dynamics would have to come into play in order for a lead agency to identify what the mechanics are for that to happen. He added that Polk County would likely have to add it to their county road network and it might cause them to have to reduce mileage from other areas to continue the mileage they currently have, so they will be discussing what the mechanics are and will primarily focus on the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue area. He explained that the reason for that is both counties have made statements that they would support the Merrifield location and understand the Cities will take care of the locations from 32<sup>nd</sup> north; and both cities have stated that they would be the appropriate lead agency at those locations, so 47<sup>th</sup> is the one that is still up in the air.

Vein commented that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue, even on the North Dakota side would be county. Haugen responded that it is located within the Grand Forks City Limits; our knowledge would say that we treat it just like 32<sup>nd</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup>, Elks, etc, so the City would be the lead agency.

Haugen stated that last month we did make a work program amendment to include the cost of this additional work. He referred to a slide illustrating the cost estimate for this additional work and went over it briefly. He pointed out that this estimate it is below the budgeted amount we approved and that it represents and reflects the scope of work that we have been discussing. He added that there was some discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee, and this has been kind of a fluid scope of work, and as you can tell we make adjustments based on information that we have received, so, again, we think this is the scope that reflects what we have been discussing.

Grasser referred to the scope of work, #5 on the second page, and commented that states that we will rely on the City of Grand Forks' input regarding existing and desired roadway cross sections and said that he is wondering if that needs to include input from the MPO. He stated that what he is wondering about is if that is going to come back to the staff and say, okay, how wide should the road be, should there be a sidewalk on one side and bikepath on the other side, and those types of things because that would probably

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

be a bigger issue than what he would put on the staff, so he isn't sure what that statement meant. He added that East Grand Forks would obviously have something to say on that for their side too. Haugen responded that what they are trying to say is that the MPO and the Consultant aren't going to make an assumption as to what is acceptable, it is to ask the appropriate road authority what they feel is acceptable, so it doesn't say "staff" so we can assume that you would be following the process and as staff you would go before your council and say that this would be the Council level of decision necessary instead of just relying on staff to provide the direction of whether the road needs to be widened or not.

Haugen stated that this was discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee and there will be a certain amount of maintenance that will be required in each of these corridors regardless of whether bridge traffic or not, so they are trying to scope out what they feel would be additional work that might be required if a bridge was located and the traffic associated with it.

Vein referred to a table and said that there are about six-line items there that are the description of the changes, and these are the description of additional items that are required to incorporate the additional crossing locations. Haugen responded that is correct, adding that it is the manpower by the different staff levels keeping these tasks updated including updating the project memo, update the matrixes with a SYNCHRO analysis of additional intersections prepare the estimate that exhibits the cost estimates. Vein commented that we are already doing these, this is just going to add the additional locations into the concept, and so the direct labor cost is \$19,000 to do that.

Haugen referred to the information that was distributed, and pointed out that it is actually \$21,000, adding that was a catch, again the bottom line didn't change, but the direct labor costs is really \$21,000, and you will see that on the sheet that was handed out.

Vein stated that from a contractor stand-point it looks like the markup is about 3.0, really close to that from you direct labor cost to your actual overall cost. Haugen responded that included in that is the profit. He commented that there is an audited amount, the overhead is separate from the fixed fee. Vein said that that is within reason. Haugen stated that the overhead rate would be what our master contract rate is at and is maintained within each amendment, and the fixed fees are 12% and are also consistent with our master contract.

Haugen pointed out that we are scoping this within the schedule that we are currently under, so we aren't trying to extend our scheduled completion date on this.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AMENDMENT #3 TO THE STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT TO PERFORM ADDITIONAL WORK FOR THE PROPOSED RIVER CROSSINGS AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED \$64,000.00.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

### Financial Forecast

Haugen reported that they have been working with staff from both cities and states to come up with revenue forecasts. He referred to the packet and stated that included is a draft of where our current assets are. He explained that, again, what we are trying to do with the revenue forecasts is to not necessarily separate out those revenues or how they are spent yet, but just to identify what revenues there are.

Haugen commented that they are also trying to identify that there are federal programs that each state distributes under different names, so they are trying to show the difference between North Dakota naming and the Minnesota naming of these programs, and if you pay attention during the T.I.P. discussions you will have these names referenced, so they should be somewhat familiar to you already.

Haugen stated that the biggest thing occurring with our revenue forecasts in the current timeframe is that on the North Dakota side they distribute most of their monies to the population 5,000 or larger communities through the Urban Regional Program and the Urban Local Program; and right now Fargo and West Fargo are part of that group of 5,000 or more, but if the Fargo Metro area reaches over 200,000 population, under federal law they become a different entity than just an MPO, they become a Transportation Management Area (TMA) and then they would receive a direct allocation of federal funds. He explained that in North Dakota there is roughly \$34 million available for the Regional and Local programs, typically split 50/50, so under this scenario North Dakota would have to give Fargo/Moorhead around \$7 million dollars of the total available statewide, and Fargo/Moorhead would no longer be competing statewide, they would have their share of the funds which means that the rest of the state entities would have 30% less revenue to seek funding from on the State Highway System.

Haugen commented that if the Urban Local Program, because Fargo/Moorhead population is removed from the funding program, we are likely going to add Watford City to the list, but it sort of shakes out that there is no change or possibly a slight increase to the Grand Forks area's allocation program, so what we are trying to work with the NDDOT on is to see if they are willing to have their State Highway System in the urban areas outside of Fargo/Moorhead take the potential 30% cut in funds. He said that if we go forward with a transportation plan that reflects a 30% cut on the State Highway System on the North Dakota side, then when we solicit for projects in our T.I.P. that also needs to be consistent and reflect that 30% cut in funding as well, so the NDDOT has some internal discussion that need to take place to determine whether or not they want to start making changes to how the Urban Regional Roads and the Urban Local Roads programs will distribute funds.

Haugen stated that even though the TMA status won't really be official until 2022, this fall we will start soliciting projects for the Year 2023 in our T.I.P. and S.T.I.P. cycle, so by the time 2022 rolls around we will have projects already identified several years into that impact if it truly 30%.

Haugen said, then, that before we get too much further in to our revenue forecasting and making a fiscally constrained plan, we would like North Dakota to make a decision on this issue because the last thing we want to do is to make progress on a 30% cut and then have them, when we are trying to adopt a plan, make that change and say that they are going to maintain their system and the 30% is going to come from someplace else, which would upset our fiscally constrained plan going forward.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein asked if there was a projected date or timeline on when the NDDOT would make that decision. Haugen responded that they had their first internal discussion last Friday on this issue. He said that they are aware of our timeline and our needs to have that decision soon. He stated that what he is asking them to do is, both ourselves and the other two MPOs have to have plans adopted by the end of 2019, and if this is still in play that they take due diligence and work with all parties involved to come up with a restructuring of this if that is the route they want to go, that they do that during the rest of this year and most of next year so that we are all operating under a similar financial assumptions in MPO areas.

Grasser commented that he thought our 2045 update was due by December of 2018. Haugen responded that ours is but the other two MPOs are due in 2019. He added, though, that they have already started their scope and are trying to get similar financial assumptions for all three MPO areas as well. He said that, again, it is something new to the NDDOT and particularly upper management, but it is something that the rest of the Urban Cities in North Dakota probably aren't aware of and probably neither the League of Cities or the Counties are fully aware of what might be happening here so he thinks if the NDDOT could just hold off on saying this might be happening for the next eighteen months and spend that time discussing this with all of the stakeholders involved and come up with a new proposal and be closer to the 2020 census which is what triggers that population number, that might be best for all of us instead of going with this assumption now and then changing it sooner than later.

Vein stated that he thinks for us now is to just be aware of this, that is really the intent of what Mr. Haugen is talking about; we don't know when we will have the answer, it will be up to the DOT to act on this. Haugen commented that for us to make progress on a fiscally constrained plan we need to have the answer within 30 days, and that is what we are trying to push them on, we aren't trying to push them to say "okay, you've identified that this might be an issue, but don't make this change in our financial assumptions, spend time working with everybody to come up with how you are going to change this", because that is going to take some time, and where we are at with our end of the year deadline, we are kind of driving the process to some extent these next 30 to 45 days.

Haugen said that the Main Street Initiative is a new North Dakota program that is just beginning and did require that some funds be taken from other areas to fund it. He commented that we were trying to agree with the NDDOT how to reasonably forecast funds in the future and we think we've settled on using a pro-ratio of the population in the urban areas of North Dakota so you will see that revenue coming and these assumptions.

Haugen commented that right now on the Urban Regional Program our history has been telling us that on average we are getting just under \$3 million dollars a year in regional highways in North Dakota, but if that decreases 30% we go down to \$2 million dollars a year, then we all know that the revenue isn't increasing as fast as the cost of the construction, so it is kind of a downward trickling effect on that program.

Haugen stated that on the Urban Local Program, because these numbers aren't reflecting that TMA status, these are the current T.I.P. numbers, we would be projecting them to have a similar path of a 2% per year growth, and then the Main Street Initiative, based on the \$4.6 million dollars, we would be looking at

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

roughly our pro-rated share of \$600,000 a year, and at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting they discussed whether this should be considered as a project eligible every year, or, because \$600,000 might not go very far on an Urban project, we might want to try using this every two years or every three years, or as East Grand Forks experiences with their City Sub-Target program every four years, to allow it to build it up to an amount that makes a larger project possible; but the Technical Advisory Committee was gravitating towards using it annually.

Haugen reported that another new item, that we aren't highlighting with a bullet, is on the Minnesota side. He explained that with our current 2040 Plan, MnDOT said that after we do the two bridges they are kind of done in East Grand Forks doing projects, but now they are coming up with a documented need of more work needing to be done in East Grand Forks than they previously thought; so now we are starting to identify the revenues to help offset those costs identified. He added that, as we discussed before, for the City's Sub-Target, East Grand Forks used to get about \$300,000 every fourth year, that is now up to \$860,000 every fourth year. He stated that those are kind of the federal programs that we can kind of expect annually to offset our project costs.

DeMers asked why the inflation numbers aren't for 2018 -2022, is that per legislature. Haugen responded that that is their financial plan. DeMers asked if 2.2% represents the typical and that they have not allocated the increase. Haugen responded that Minnesota does a ten-year financial plan, and they had projects already committed to those four years so that is why they are being held constant. He added that there are additional funds coming in, and they are creating these additional project requests separate from the sub-target, that is why the sub-targets are flat, and they are funding those funds through these other programs.

Haugen reported that there are some State funds that distributed. He explained that on the North Dakota side these are funds that were offered one time, and we can't rely on it for future revenue, but they are just acknowledging that it happened in the past, but we aren't anticipating it in the future. He stated that on the Minnesota side there are quite a few additional programs that are available, that finance a lot through State funds, and East Grand Forks has enjoyed some project funding out of these programs. He pointed out, however, that you can see in our dollar values there isn't a large amount of money from the State resources, most of this is the match dollars to the Regional Program on the North Dakota side.

Powers asked for information on the Local Bridge Bonding Program. Haugen responded that the State of Minnesota sells bonds to replace and repair bridges throughout the State of Minnesota, and that is the program they do this through.

Haugen stated that they tried to identify all of the local revenue sources available, and the big thing is that the City of Grand Forks increased their sales tax and a lot of those monies will be put into their road system. He added that on the North Dakota County side they need some federal funding to maintain some of the County roads in the MPO area, this would be the match for that.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side they are trying to work with Rich Sanders, County Engineer, to come up with somewhat more of an assumption as to what an annual amount, or again if we are going to an amount every so many years, that will be spent in an MPO area to maintain the county road

system. DeMers asked about the county sales tax. Haugen responded that some of that sales tax is being spent within the MPO area this construction season.

DeMers asked, for the Grand Forks sales tax, are there regulations to how it is used, can it be used as match to federal funding, or are there any limits on how it can be used, can it be used on local streets, the interstate, or other areas. Grasser responded that if you were to characterize the \$3 million dollars; \$2 million is going towards maintaining local streets, and the other \$1 million is more for capacity improvements and things like that. He said that there is no hard language in the bill, as that is how they represented it so people could get a sense of where we were trying to apportion the money, but they also know how they previously used taxes to help us to do federal matches and things; and some of this money can be used for federal match also, but there is a stream out of here that is pulled off to non-project related things, so the entire \$3 million isn't available for projects and street repair. Haugen commented that the new sales tax will sunset before the end of 2045 so we have eight years where we will have the increase in our revenue stream for projects.

### **Universe Of Projects**

Haugen reported that similarly for the Universe of Projects, they presented a working list of projects. He stated that sort of the range of values that are there for them, where they are located, the bulk of them are in discretionary; again, \$100 Million of this total probably is the four of five new river crossings, but there are a substantial number of projects that they have identified as needed but did not identify a financial means to get them done, so they are still working with staff on defining these projects.

Haugen commented that North Dakota and Minnesota have agreed to some additional work on the Kennedy and Sorlie Bridges being scoped, but those will be in the latter years of our transportation plan as they both were just worked on so they aren't seeing a need to do anything soon. He added that they do have a question about the Point Bridge, as was explained at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, if two state owned bridges are being looked at as having a maintenance need in the life of this plan, and the Point Bridge was done ten years earlier, we may also need to be looking at some sort of project being needed on it as well. He said that they did identify as a discretionary project just the approach fix on the Minnesota side, that is separate from what we are discussing here as the rest of the bridge work.

Vein said that Mr. Haugen said that the other two bridges are state owned bridges, so the Point Bridge is not then. Haugen responded that it is not, it is a local bridge.

Haugen stated that once they have a good working list that is when they start assembling the jurisdictions on each side of the river, and start coordinating those lists and coming up with a strategy along with a financial plan of what is available to fund what projects and will spend a lot of time in June and July to try to get things down to some groups of alternatives to consider as packages that are fiscally constrained.

Haugen said that they are planning on holding a public meeting in July to talk about the Draft Plan. He added that he would say it is labeled as Draft Plan Groupings, to try to not tell them this is the Draft Plan yet, but that it is a draft grouping of projects that we think might be accomplished with our fiscal constraint issue. He said that this will then lead into a September timeline when we will have a Draft Plan.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein commented that as he was looking at this, back at the very beginning you have the plan update schedule where we are at, that is the overall timeframe that we are trying to meet to be complete by the end of the year, is that correct. Haugen responded it is. Vein said that one of the significant pieces that we have all been aware of is the bridge location; where is the timeline where you think that discussion will take place, and what is the timing for the decision. Haugen responded that they will try to have that information at our July Technical Advisory Committee, Executive Policy Board, Public meetings and City Councils. He said that once we have the tech memo updated that you just approved, and some additional information, we will try to convene another of those round board meetings with the other entities involved to discuss it and see if things are starting to be clearer as to location(s).

Vein asked what that process actually looks like; the MPO will be the entity that makes the final decision and will both City Councils and County Commissions have to concur with that decision. Haugen responded that it isn't a requirement that they concur with it but seek their input and hope they will reach the same conclusions. Vein stated that he just wonders if that timeline is realistic because if there is controversy around it, especially from the public standpoint it may take more time than may be traditional to come to a conclusion.

Strandell asked if this means that the MPO can determine a plan, but they don't have any textbook knowledge and they can't do any construction; what is our role. Haugen responded that when you seek funding for your projects those projects need to be consistent with the plan, and because it is a fiscally constrained plan that makes it a little more onerous than maybe a county or city plan that isn't tied by federal law to be fiscally constrained, so projects that are consistent with the plan go through that process of determining if there is really money available to do the projects, and if there is money available for those projects, what is the priority order of the projects, and that is why we review it at least a minimum of every five years. He added that we don't build the roadways, but we are planning and programming them.

Vein commented that the bridge location will be shared between the two communities, or it could be the counties. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Haugen reported that one of the things that; this is brand new information from yesterday afternoon, in talking about the bridge, when MnDOT started identifying their list of projects, and as he said in the current plan they said that after they do the two bridges they are just finishing up now, they didn't see any additional work, but now they are identifying work. He said that one of the things they are identifying is, not just the work on the Sorlie Bridge, but work on DeMers Avenue and U.S. Business #2 on the Minnesota side, and they've identified it in their spread sheet as a turnback opportunity. He said that means that at least from 4<sup>th</sup> Street out to U.S.#2 that segment of U.S. Business #2 would be turned back to the City.

Haugen stated that one of the things MnDOT is proposing with that turnback is that they would take over ownership and responsibility of DeMers Avenue all with way out to Highway #220. He added that they also threw in, as an enticement to the City to consider this is that they would have funds programmed to bring those roadways up to the State Highway standard, but then they said that the City could decide to spend those funds elsewhere, perhaps at a fourth bridge location.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that he is probably sharing this to you out of turn without seeing if East Grand Forks has that information, but that is how fast things will be moving in the next several months on this issue. He added that the turnback suggestion isn't new, it has been discussed in the past, but the new wrinkle is identifying it as funding source.

Vein stated that our next meeting will be in June, which will be close to the timing, so will we have a more thorough update on some of that information. Haugen responded that they would give a progress report, and will have East Grand Forks, after internal discussion, let us know if they are receptive to the turnback, are those the right roadways to have turned back. He said that, again, some of you might have a longer history of this turnback issue, twelve years ago maybe, East Grand Forks and MnDOT discussed turnback, at that time they were talking all of Business #2 being turned back, this time MnDOT is only talking about the segment from 4<sup>th</sup> Street out to the Bert's Truck area. He added that they would still maintain as a State Highway/US Highway DeMers Avenue and would add on out to Highway #220.

Information only.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE BASED MEASURES MEMORANDUM  
OF UNDERSTANDING/AGREEMENT**

Haugen reported that last month you held the Draft Minnesota Memorandum of Understanding on the Performance Based Planning Process, you wanted to see North Dakota's language. He said that included in the packet is the North Dakota language; as mentioned they were going to base theirs off of the Minnesota draft. He pointed out that the substantial difference between the two is that North Dakota is not as advanced in the other performance measure areas as Minnesota, so the North Dakota draft is really only addressing the Highway Safety Improvement Program process, and they are holding off on writing up text that addresses the rest of the performance measure areas.

Haugen commented that after going through Minnesota's pages you can see the North Dakota pages used just the Highway Safety Improvement Program, and that is all that they were willing to put into an agreement process right now. He said that the language of the MOU is the same between states; there is a slight difference on the North Dakota side as they are suggesting only 30 days whereas Minnesota is suggesting 90 days.

Haugen stated that East Grand Forks has already signed-off on the Minnesota document as a transit operator, he isn't sure where Grand Forks transit is on their signing. He added that the Technical Advisory Committee recommends approval of both of these documents as presented.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE  
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR PERFORMANCE BASED MEASURES, AS  
PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

***MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT FOR PERFORMANCE BASED MEASURES, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF STATE PM2 AND PM3 TARGETS**

Haugen reported that the month of May is when both States need to address these PM2 and PM3 Targets. He said that PM2 are the pavement and bridge measures and PM3 is basically travel time reliability on different segments.

Haugen stated that the PM2 Targets are identified as four-year targets with the first two years having a performance evaluation done that allows the States to modify what their four-year target is after a two year period.

Haugen commented that for the PM 2 Targets there is also a penalty if there is not progress, but PM3, or travel reliability there is no penalty clause.

Haugen said that the Minnesota targets are set, North Dakota's Director has not finalized yet on those targets. He added that we will have 180 days after May 20<sup>th</sup>, when they are formally submitted to Federal Highway, so that will get us to right around mid-November.

Haugen referred to a table and went over the targets briefly, pointing out that there are some slight differences between the States, but there are a lot of similarities also between the two states. He said that both States, particularly on the pavement and bridge are working to the best of their systems ability, and he says that because there are some new measures that the feds are requiring that they are just now collecting the data on, but based on their past pavement management and bridge management methods, in working with these targets to make sure to the best of their ability that they are going to not have a penalty imposed on them for not getting progress towards them, so when we talk about percent of bridges in good condition, 50% or 60%, both States are feeling comfortable that those targets are something that they can easily achieve and not have to divert a lot of money on to reach those targets.

Haugen said that the only place where there is a large disagreement between both States would be this truck travel time and reliability, and that is the very bottom one. He commented that you will notice the percent of reliable person miles on the interstate, 85% means to you or me that 85% of the time we can expect to have the same travel time to go across an interstate segment. He said that the truck travel time is reported differently, it is reported as a ratio; on the Minnesota side it is 1.5 and that is basically saying that during the worst times you might have 50% more travel time to get through that same segment; and on the North Dakota side they are using 3 so they are saying three times more travel time going through that same segment.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that this is where the States are at with their PM2 and PM3 targets, and we have until November to decide if we are going to accept these targets or establish our own.

DeMers asked, then, if we were going to change like, say the percentage of bridges in good condition to 60%, how would that affect our funding. Haugen responded that that would be part of the discussion and collaborative process with the States for us to establish a target different from theirs, as they are obviously a partner in our process so we would have to have those discussions and determinations as to what that means as far as to meet those targets and who is paying their share of the current formula distribution.

DeMers asked, then similarly if we went to 40% would that mean that we would have more money allocated, he would think that we would get a cut then. Haugen responded that, again we might have to get into the discussion of whose facilities are going to 40% versus, we would have to still be consistent, collaborative and cooperative with each state so it would have to be agreeable to set a lower threshold on their State facilities. DeMers asked if that is the number of bridges or value of bridges. Haugen responded that for the bridges it is all just those that are on the NHS system and the vast majority of the bridges and the definition of bridges would include culverts, and the vast majority of those are not on the NHS system and these targets are only establishing NHS facilities. He added that there are State Highways that aren't on the NHS system and there are city roads that are on the NHS system.

Information only.

**MATTER OF STATE PM1 (SAFETY) TARGETS**

Haugen reported that these are annual target settings for this particular measure. He said that the States, because they are also tied to a different agency on fatalities and fatality rates, they needed to come up with these State targets in June so most states are proposing these numeric values.

Haugen commented that on the positive side most states are continuing to show a decline or are not targeting more of these types of crashes to occur, but formally the States won't be setting our clock off until the end of August, but because of the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration's deadline of July 1<sup>st</sup>, they have to set some of these so they are setting all of them now. He added that they are still showing less crashes occurring, but they will continue to have progress towards that Vision Zero concept.

Information only.

**MATTER OF PROPOSED NEW CITIES AREA TRANSIT ROUTES**

Kouba reported that they received quite a bit of feedback from the public meetings that were held over the last month, and there will be a change in several of the routes that are being proposed, just based on those comments they received from the public, so hopefully they will be able to show that to both City Councils soon.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, May 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Kouba commented that the Cities Area Transit is trying to make these changes beginning on July 2<sup>nd</sup>. Vein asked if they have to have all the maps and everything updated soon. Kouba responded that they will be bringing the updated routes to the City Council on May 29<sup>th</sup>, and hopefully can get final approval on June 4<sup>th</sup>. Vein asked if there would be any public hearings on this. Kouba responded that there won't be any public hearings as they are actually doing the public meeting process right now with the draft routes. Vein said, then that there won't be any required meeting at either of the council meetings. Kouba responded that that is correct.

Discussion on the changes ensued.

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 4/14/18 to 5/11/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the April 14, 2018 to May 11, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:14 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the June 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 47<sup>th</sup> 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 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Bridge location.

Strandell commented that after this meeting he would like to take anyone that can make it out there to show where 47<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 47<sup>th</sup> 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 47<sup>th</sup> 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 20<sup>th</sup>, 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 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2018,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:50 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**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

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Clarence Vetter, Secretary, called the August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Gary Malm, Don Diedrich (Proxy for Warren Strandell), Clarence Vetter, Marc DeMers, Jeannie Mock, Mike Powers, and Al Grasser. Ken Vein reported present at 12:15 p.m.

Guest(s): David Kuharneko, Grand Forks Engineering

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vetter declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE JULY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS TO APPROVE THE JULY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL 2019-2022 FINAL DRAFT T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that included in the packet is full T.I.P. document. He stated that a public hearing was held at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday and there were no written or oral comments submitted.

Haugen said that this Final T.I.P. combines both sides. He added that in the most recent past we have been adopting separate documents for each side of the river, and this is one of the few times, recently, that we will have one unified T.I.P. document. He commented that the other thing to note is the this will be our first T.I.P. document that includes the section about performance measures and how the T.I.P. is trying to help us make progress towards that, and we did amend that language into our existing T.I.P. on just the Minnesota side, but this will be for both sides.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that the big item is that the decision is to still go with reconstructing the Washington Street Underpass in 2022, and it is programmed at its full \$17 million plus dollars yet the project development process will still go through, and as with any project development process the do nothing alternative is always one of the candidates, but it is starting out as a full reconstruction.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of illustrative projects that show up in the last section before the appendices. He stated that they are on the North Dakota side and are the traffic signal rehabilitation projects that were submitted for consideration of regional and urban programs funding. He pointed out that the NDDOT has them identified as pending in 2022 and in the North Dakota S.T.I.P. that term “pending” is the equivalent of our T.I.P. illustrative projects, meaning that they don’t have the fiscal constraint to show them as being programmed, but if funding is made available they will likely be programmed after 2022. He added that if funding does show up in latter years, or at some point, these would have to be amended out of the illustrative list and into our programmed list.

Haugen stated that, other than what he just discussed the document is pretty straight-forward. He added that the appendices are our normal appendices; the first is where our current 2018 projects are at and the actual dollars that were obligated to them. He commented that we also have our Self-Certification document included, and that basically says that these are all the federal rules and regulations that we were required to follow, and that we are self-certifying that we are doing so. He pointed out that our geographical area map remains unchanged.

Haugen commented that we just promulgated a Draft Minnesota T.I.P.; this year we did not draft a North Dakota T.I.P. as North Dakota went straight to a Draft S.T.I.P., and that was a little unusual but we are covering both sides of this final document.

Haugen stated that the last appendix is a requirement from Minnesota that their projects be shown in NWATP format.

Haugen said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending you approve the Draft Final 2019-2022 T.I.P.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE FY2019-2022 T.I.P., AS PRESENTED.***

***Voting Aye: Malm, DeMers, Vetter, Diedrich, Mock, Powers, and Grasser.***

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
CONSULTANT**

Haugen reported that they did release the RFP; proposals were due on August 14<sup>th</sup>; and they received only one proposal so they did seek concurrence from our State and Federal Partners to proceed with

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

interviews of that one firm, and did receive that approval. He added that they then interviewed that firm, which was KLJ Engineering.

Vein reported present.

Haugen commented that there were some interesting things with this proposal. He stated that KLJ submitted a proposal that basically followed the original Draft RFP, and they said that one reason why they did so was because when they communicated with the City of Grand Forks they were told to do so and that the City would work out the differences, including cost, later on. He said that most likely what happened was a misunderstanding of communications they had with the City of Grand Forks. He added that, long story short, right now KLJ is looking through the proposal to trim it back to what the actual RFP Scope request was. He stated that they did seek some guidance from NDDOT to see how much over the RFP scope and budget we could go to be able to award a contract; and their basic response was that they aren't comfortable going to the extent that KLJ's proposal originally did, but KLJ has also indicated that they aren't so sure that if they did scope down to just the budget that they could do what is in the RFP scope; so North Dakota is saying that until they see what KLJ's actual number for the scope is, they aren't really able to give us an answer of how much, if it is over budget, they will be comfortable with, so as it stands right now KLJ promised that sometime today they will have their scaled back proposal and budget to us so unless the Board wants to have a special meeting to approve the scaled back proposal, what might be appropriate is, as in the past, you authorize your Finance Committee to go ahead and execute the contract on your behalf.

Haugen reported that we do know that timing is an issue as he thinks the City of Grand Forks was wishing that this may have already been approved and the project underway, so if we wait until our next regular meeting, that might be too long for them; so that is why the option to authorize the Finance Committee to act on the Board's behalf was suggested; but again you can also choose to hold a special meeting as well. He added that both options are assuming that we get a scope from KLJ with a budget that is comfortable, not only for us but also for our State and Federal Partners to sign off on as well.

Mock asked if Mr. Haugen knew what that contract is expected to back at, what numbers. Haugen responded that the budget in our work program was set at \$60,000. He stated that the base bid that KLJ submitted was in the \$120,000 range; and again, if you recall, last month, and the minutes will reflect that we deleted number four from the scope, and that was to do a lot of the transportation operation analysis for the downtown area, so that is a lot of work and that was still included in their base project.

Mock asked if the new scope would be brought back to the City for their approval of the local share. Haugen responded that it would not. He added that there has been some discussions that if there is a difference in cost and the State and Federal Partners are comfortable with us to contract, that a separate contract negotiated between the City and the consultant could be done, that might have to go back through the council.

Vetter asked if the board wants to wait until its next meeting to approve this, or are do we want to authorize the Finance Committee to execute it.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE FINANCE COMMITTEE TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT AFTER NEGOTIATIONS.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: None.*

**MATTER OF PROJECT SOLICITATION FOR THE 2019-2020 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Haugen reported that this is just an information item. He explained that typically at this time of the year we solicit what studies our member jurisdictions would like us to consider programming into our work program.

Haugen commented that there are a couple of things that we already know that we will have to do; we have to update our ITS Regional Architecture Plan; and we also know that the Downtown Plan, the Skewed Intersection Study, and the Mn #220 North Study that we are just now getting underway on will have to be carried over into 2019, but there are still some funds available, about \$150,000 available for 2019 and \$300,000 for 2020.

Haugen stated that this was announced at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week so your staff should be working on identifying projects. He added that we did ask that they work with us to make sure that eligibility is something that we fully understand so that we aren't trying at the last minute to squeeze stuff through, so we have communication about whether things are eligible or not.

Haugen said that we always want to ensure that whatever each member jurisdiction submits to us has gone through their governing body so that they are knowledgeable about the study and also to authorize us to undertake it.

Haugen commented that November is when we would have the next two year work program before you for consideration so there is time between now and then to vet through all of the items. He added that we do have to have a full two-year work program submitted to our State and Federal Partners by the end of November for their consideration.

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

a. Universe Of Projects

Haugen reported that there is information in your packet; some of that is being updated so he will go through a slightly revised presentation. He added that he did just distribute some updated pages with the most significant changes since the packet was mailed out last Friday.

Presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that a lot of the information is just updating you on where we are at on the schedule. He said that when it comes to the performance measures, right now they are looking at the Mobility Measures, or what are known as PM3, and they have to do with Interstate Truck Travel, and that is our freight component of planning.

Haugen commented that within these performance measures we have the ability to, again, adopt wholeheartedly each State and their targets, just do our own targets, or for one target we can adopt both States and for another we can adopt our own, kind of bounce back and forth.

Haugen stated, an overview of the data, both States have had to adopt their Targets, we have until November to adopt ours. He referred to a slide showing the targets that North Dakota and Minnesota have adopted, and commented that you will notice that Minnesota shows that some are not applicable because they don't have interstate in Minnesota, however if we were to adopt wholeheartedly Minnesota State targets we would be adopting their actual target for the Interstate System.

Haugen commented that one of the things you will notice is that in some areas our data is similar, such as for the non-interstate travel; 85 for North Dakota and 75 for Minnesota and we are right around the upper 80's. He said that for the interstate travel our data is showing that we have 100% reliability versus 85% on the North Dakota side and 75% on the Minnesota side.

Haugen pointed out that the one with the most variance is the freight or truck travel. He said that North Dakota set a rather extreme target of 3; while our data is showing closer to 1.1 or 1.2. He added that all of this information comes from Federal Highway and makes this transition for this reliability calculation smooth they contracted with a consortium of university technical centers to develop an easy tool for us to go to and use. He referred to a slide showing the output of that tool; and pointed out where he highlighted where we have, according to the data, our most unreliable

Haugen stated that this is just a summary and added that we still have to identify our pavement management and bridge management targets. He referred to a slide and went over the PM2 and PM3 targets for North Dakota, Minnesota and the MPO. He added that right now staff is leaning towards not adopting each State's wholeheartedly, but where it makes sense to adopt the State's standards we should adopt them but when we have just a North Dakota facility we should adopt as our normal target perhaps what the North Dakota target is, but not adopt it as the State's target but as our local target. He said that in the case of the truck travel reliability, he thinks the three is kind of extreme, so they are still trying to figure out why North Dakota did that; and even the Minnesota target is something that is close to what we would be trying to achieve with our local target.

Haugen said that they aren't asking for action on this today, but are giving you some sense of what staff is recommending. He stated that they will probably have this information for action next month, just because it will fit in with our Long Range Transportation Plan document that we are preparing and not waiting until the very end of November when we are trying to adopt a plan in December.

Mock asked if we set a local target do we have to meet or exceed the States' targets, or do we just set our own local target based on research. Haugen responded that we are trying to achieve our local target. He said that some of the PM2 targets have some penalty clauses, and they only are applied if the State

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

does not meet their targets, if the MPO does not meet its target there isn't a penalty, per se. He added that on the PM3 there is no penalty at either the States or the MPO level.

Grasser referred to the PM2/PM3 slide and commented that he is confused about the different 4-year target numbers for the percent of interstate pavement in good condition and asked why we wouldn't adopt the States numbers instead of having our own. Haugen responded that essentially we are adopting the States standards but we can't say that because then we would technically have to adopt the Minnesota standards as well and we don't have interstate on the Minnesota side in our area; so it is either all or nothing.

b. Revenue Forecasts

Haugen stated that one of the major hiccups we have going on is that when we look at our forecasted revenue, based on historical information from the North Dakota side, we continue to talk about interstate, and you see that the adjustment has not flowed strongly into the MPO area, so we can really only identify on that basis that over the 25-year period \$10 million dollars can help us on interstate. He commented that when we look at the projects the District has identified that are necessary to keep the interstate in a state of good repair, it will take over \$45 million dollars of projects over that same period, so we have that disconnect; only \$10 million coming in and \$45 million needed; and again those are projects that are needed to keep the pavement in a state of good repair, that doesn't include any modifications to existing interchanges, or adding new interchanges to the system.

Haugen reported that in trying to work with North Dakota on how to reconcile the difference, their basic advice was that they would push it back onto our shoulders to come up with a reasonable number, somewhere in-between, and document what it is and we essentially will be good to go with it, so we are continuing to work with them on documenting what might be reasonable. He added that under law we are supposed to emphasize preservation of the existing system, and emphasize facilities serving national and regional transportation so it seems like if we have revenue, on the State side instead of it going towards maybe regional highway projects, we should focus on the interstate.

Grasser commented that if you extrapolate that process down the line then we are pulling from regional to do the interstate which means that regional is going to be shorted which means that you will draw from urban, is that the way the things are going to line up. Haugen responded that in the past that is how they would, but this particular year, on the regional side we are currently showing a little more revenue left after the projects they identified; so in this case there might be regional funds left on the table, if you will. He added that there are still a couple of questions that we need to get answers on from the District regarding the regional project list, some clarifications, but the way it looks right now there will be millions of dollars left on the regional revenue so we likely may not touch the urban pot.

Grasser said that he would also assume that you aren't going to do any capacity improvements on the regional system. He added that they have studies that show the need for underpasses and stuff on Highway 2; so are we going to just preserve it, is that what that plan is that has any money left over at all. Haugen responded that that was correct. Grasser stated that he is struggling with the anomalies of the systems where the government gives us performance measures; realistically doesn't have dollars; we are still trying to deal with their world.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

c. Bridge Analysis

Haugen reported that this is where we have new information to share with you. He said that, again, looking at all five of these crossing, all five are trying to focus on the local traffic connectivity, mobility issues and needs, and their analysis has been focused on that local traffic.

Haugen commented that you did see some of these slides already. He added that the data shows that the further north you go the better off you are.

Haugen stated that they did get into the individual intersections levels of service this time. He referred to slides with this information and went them briefly. He commented that if we don't do anything these intersections have issues. He said that if we add a bridge they all have issues, but there is some mitigation that we can do, most of which would be traffic signals; that bring us up to an acceptable level of service; although there are a couple, DeMers and South Washington and South Washington and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue would need a little bit more than just the standard traffic signal.

Haugen said that on the South Washington/DeMers Avenue intersection they previously identified the continuous flow intersection option to solve that issue. He added that it isn't a grade separation so its impact isn't as great, nor is its cost. He stated that on the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue/South Washington intersection there is a concept called "Quadrant Connecting Roadway" where it kind of creates intersections both on 32<sup>nd</sup> and South Washington that we try to have traffic that wants to turn to use a different roadway intersection to get around a congested intersection, so it is kind of a by-pass new roadway connecting to get traffic pulled away from one intersection and split it to two intersections.

Haugen referred to the next few slides and pointed out that they cover cost information and are just the costs that do basically the blue line shown on the slides; it wouldn't cover any additional work. He added that these are the general alignments that they have been working with for each of the crossings.

Haugen said that, just to talk a little bit about the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue Minnesota Jurisdictional meeting; we do know that anything connecting out here has some roadway jurisdictional issues that need to be addressed if we are going to put a bridge at this location.

Haugen reported that the next slides show how they are coming up with the basic cost estimates. He pointed out that he circled the \$300 sq. foot, and explained that that is the number that they were using based on outdated cost estimation formulas that both States were using due to the influence of the oil activity primarily, which jacked prices up; but North Dakota just this morning is suggesting we start using a considerably lower number, somewhere between \$200 and \$250. He added that Minnesota also concurred this morning that \$250 is something they would be willing to support.

Haugen referred to a slide and stated that it gives us a basis of what the cross sections are for these bridge estimates. He said that they are going with what they characterize as an Urban Bridge. He explained that that means because it is in an urban setting we do have the multi-purpose trail attached to it with one through lane in each direction and then there is a shoulder area available in the event there is a breakdown on the bridge so that traffic can continue to flow.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that they provided some idea of what the costs were back in the 2025 Plan versus what costs are now. He said that these costs are based on that \$300 a square foot, so they are high, and they will be slightly lower next time you see them, but there is still substantially higher than they were 20 years ago.

Haugen commented that they also had a discussion about whether we should show the benefits of truck traffic that would or wouldn't use the bridges. He said that kind of the default mode of this is to include some truck traffic in the benefits. He stated that after discussion with the Technical Advisory Committee we decided that we could easily separate out the "no trucks", and it doesn't impact the benefits too much because there aren't a lot of trucks that are using these more local types bridges. He added that it gets more substantial when you start talking about Merrifield.

Haugen stated that the next few slides give us some sense of where we are at with the benefit cost. He pointed out that he inserted the 2025 numbers so you can see that even though the cost has gone up considerably, the benefits have also gone up considerably. He went over the information briefly, pointing out the they did a high and a low bridge estimate for each crossing.

Haugen referred to the information he distributed earlier and explained that last Friday, with the information they knew then, they highlighted that we had some bridges that were above the .5 benefit/cost. He said that the three locations with asterisks probably could be tweaked to get them up to a value greater and 1. He reported that one thing they did since Friday, shown in blue, was to use the 2025 cost methodology and you can see the results of that; Elks, 32<sup>nd</sup>, and Merrifield all come very close to the 1 value.

Haugen commented that just this morning; using the new \$250 a square foot price he simply deducted roughly 17% of the cost off of the bridge total; a quick calculation with the benefits, and we are getting .8 at Elks, .9 at 32<sup>nd</sup>, .6 at Merrifield, so there are some things that we can do to lower the cost of these structures. He went over some of those options briefly.

Vein asked if on the B/C ratio do we need to have something greater than 1 for either State to put money toward the project. Haugen responded that most of the competitive grant programs, either at the national level, or Minnesota, that is one of their criteria, if it doesn't show a benefit cost of at least 1 it isn't favorably viewed.

DeMers asked of the B/C ratio based on year zero or is it amortized throughout the life of that structure. Haugen responded that his initial response is that it is over a twenty-five year period, but he will double check that to make sure.

Powers asked if we are trying to get to the top three choices. Haugen responded that we have been trying to narrow this down for quite some time. Powers said that the other thing it, for simplicity sake and to expedite the process, are we going to eliminate the high bridge concept just based on the costs. He stated that if we were to agree on just continuing with the low bridge option for all crossings we can eliminate that part of the equation out of the way and then we should, as a group, make a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

recommendation...where are we at at the East Grand Forks City Council on this. Vetter responded that the council is waiting for a recommendation from this board. Powers said that maybe today we can tell them that we agreed that we have to have a low bridge, and that we agreed on three crossings; if we did that today that would be huge. Vetter asked which three crossings Mr. Powers was thinking should continue to be included in the study. Powers responded that that is a good question.

Vein commented that, along that line, it appears that we are trying to manipulate, to some degree, the methods to find a B/C that is greater than 1, is that right. Haugen responded that it could appear that way, and some would argue that it is, but he thinks that where we started out with at \$300 a square foot was based on, perhaps, old cost estimate data, and now that we have more current data, and it is lower, we are just carrying on that same calculation using that new numbers and it is coming out the way it is coming out.

Grasser said that the concern he has is how close we are going to be able to represent an actual project. He added that he is looking at these numbers, unfortunately this pushes the B/C ratio the other way, but earlier on we talked about mitigation that might have to happen, like signalize an intersection, and we should almost put an allowance of some sort into each of these estimates to do whatever traffic mitigation we might have to do that is associated with new bridge impact, whether that is a million, two million or whatever. He added that the low bridge, especially the low bridge is going to require a lot of analysis and approval from technically FEMA, but it will also end up going through the Corps of Engineers, and he thinks that those costs are, if they are going to be reflected on the engineering side of the world, he thinks the engineering costs are going to be quite a bit higher than what we show here. He said that contingency, at 10-percent at this stage, and again this is his opinion, but he thinks that is a pretty low number, so the \$300 a square foot on the bridge may have been high, but it was also tending to be a buffer that might absorb some of these others, Simply skimming that down we ignore some of the other costs that he thinks are going to come in and he doesn't want to be blind-sighted then when we get too far down the pike with a project that comes in substantially higher; or quite frankly do we go with these numbers and then deal with them later; there are a couple of different philosophies in the world, be his would be to try to get that number to represent what things might be a little more accurate. He added that the low bridge, he thinks is going to end up having hydraulic impacts on the river, that is kind of what he remembers they found with the pedestrian bridges, and he doesn't know if everyone remembers those discussions. He commented that they looked at high, medium and low bridges and to summarize it he remembers that the high bride was okay because it was above water so it didn't have a hydraulic impact, but with low bridges by the time you got away from having a hydraulic impact it ended up being so low they weren't really practical for the pedestrians to use, so the middle size, as you get through some of these critical elevation ranges, started having effects on the flood project, but the bottom line is he thinks there is going to end up being a pretty substantial FEMA and Corps analysis on the bridge. Powers added that that is going to affect the low bridge costs substantially, going upward.

Powers asked, in lieu of what we have done since 1997, don't you feel that a catastrophic flood of that nature, that would happen say this spring, would have less impact on a low base bridge because of all the other changes that have occurred both up and down stream. Grasser responded that he isn't sure, all he is saying here is that to answer that question it will take the Corp or FEMA will require additional

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

study to answer it. He added that what makes him nervous, and is a sideway answer to Mr. Powers' question, is that since we built it 1997, we were under the impression that we were at a 210 or 250 year event level of protection, right; well based on the discussions that have occurred in Fargo with the diversion, and Mr. Vein can answer those more specifically, but our flood frequency have gone up so in his mind, and this is something he would like to study on the Grand Forks side, but we have gone from a 210 year level of protection to something substantially less, just based on statistics, and it depends on whose statistics you are using, so just guessing he is going to say we are at a 150 year level of protection instead of a 210 level, so, again, do we want to add any more risks to that, that's a bigger policy.

Vein commented that they don't know what the final plan is for Fargo, but he does know that the Minnesota DNR wanted to change upstream impacts to downstream impact; and would authorize up to a 6-inch to a foot rise downstream, that was real concerning. He said that he did speak against that as part of that process, but the DNR was willing to try to do that so there would be less land, potentially, inundated in the future on the upstream side. He added that he doesn't know where that will end up with the final plan that is being done, but he thinks that we, as a community all have to be concerned that we shouldn't have to pay for the cost of having to raise our dikes if that happens, we just can't accept it, and we want to help our neighbors, but there is a mitigation cost that will have to be incorporated into their pocket. Grasser commented that even with or without the project, what caught their attention was early on when they were doing analysis they said that there was no impact to Grand Forks, well that elevation is a foot higher than what our current 100 year flood plain is, but they responded that they used the new analysis and if you use the new analysis, even without the Fargo project they are saying that our base flood went up at least a foot, and if he is interpreting what he heard the FEMA guys say they are saying that most likely when they remap again that base elevation will go up even higher, so if you were to design the flood project today you would either build it up another foot higher than it currently is to get the same 210 year protection, or you are going to accept that the dikes are less than 210 years today.

Discussion on flood protection ensued.

DeMers asked what Grand Forks Engineering usually factors for engineering on major projects. Grasser responded that, again, it depends on whether or not they are expecting to get federal funding or local funding. He said that if they are getting federal funding he has to factor in probably another 10% on the engineering and miscellaneous things that go in it. He added that he doesn't have as big of an issue on the 25% construction; he thinks it might be a bit low; contingencies at this stage he thinks at 10% there is an awful lot of unknowns for the \$3 million dollars to absorb. DeMers stated that they typically look at 15% for engineering on local projects; and then if they are going to do something, or you're looking at additional study or something like that; are you thinking that engineering should be 35% or do you think, to factor in those hydrology studies and impact studies, and those types of things. Grasser responded that contingencies at this stage should be 15% or 20%, engineering should be probably be at least 30% or 35% if we want to capture some of those others, but again it depends on how conservative you want to be, the problem is if you raise these numbers it works the B/C the other way, but he agrees that for local projects 15% is pretty typical, but a bridge structure brings in another level of engineering expertise, which costs more per hour, and there are a lot of other things that go on with a bridge so he thinks the engineering costs will be greater too.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

Powers said that Polk County has gone on record as endorsing Merrifield Road correct. Deidrich responded that he doesn't really want to comment on that because he quite frankly doesn't know, and he isn't sure they can endorse it anyway. Powers stated that he thought Mr. Strandell said that they had. Deidrich said that he isn't going to speak for him. Powers said that that is something that we need to know so next time you get together try to find that out. Deidrich responded that he thinks you are probably correct, but he can't say for sure. Malm stated that Grand Forks County already approved Merrifield Road. Powers commented that that is something that we should be looking at and you should be looking at. Grasser asked if Merrifield wasn't in by default, it's already in our Long Range Plan. Haugen commented that when they set up the scope of work to do this update we assumed that we would be carrying these projects, but the request came to us that we need to revisit all of these crossings and start basically from scratch, and that is how we ultimately got to the point of looking at five different crossings, so it is in our current plan but as we go through the updating process we don't know if it will stay in the current plan or not.

Mock asked, let's say that we decided, based on this analysis, that 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue rose to the top and we all agree on that and it is going to happen, would Merrifield Road, as a bridge be eliminated from the Long Range Transportation Plan or would it be an additional one. Haugen responded that he thinks that if the first part is true then the second part would pivot from it because right now all the analysis is for a bridge to serve local focus, so if you transition Merrifield to serve another purpose, and that would be to the traditional purpose as a bypass, and that is why it is in the current plan, to serve that purpose, as we've gone through this plan update the focus has been on the local traffic, trying to find a location of for local traffic, and the request was to look at all five of these sites for that purpose. Mock said, then, that it is possible that we would transition from regional truck traffic to local traffic as a focus, or is it possible we would select a new one and keep Merrifield for truck traffic. She said that she knows that at one point there was discussion that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue would require additional infrastructure to even access that bridge, and if Elks Drive were chosen how would it impact 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue to support increased traffic, are those costs captured in the bridge estimate. Haugen responded they are not. He added that that is where they are at, so how much further do you want us to study those options that offer a low B/C ratio, how much further do you want us to further analyze costs associated with a high bridge. He said that it doesn't seem logical for them to spend more money on those things that we will probably never get the B/C ratio up to even a .5.

Haugen commented though that there are some here that are close, with the \$250 a square foot, that some of these other costs would be worth our effort to add in and narrow down our focus to just those that we are going to spend our resources on, and really polish up those numbers that we are more comfortable with. He said that some of these we are taking kind of a little return on investment to begin with, and then to add costs to it there may be some minor benefits added, but it will probably never get where it needs to be, so that is kind of why we assumed in an update that we really weren't going to spend a lot of time revisiting all of these places and we've been trying to narrow the focus ever since and we've been going the opposite way.

Vein stated that for him he thinks that make sense because it is no use to continue to put a lot of money in studying options that just aren't going to get there. He said that when you were looking at just this

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

cost of \$250 a square foot, and you looked at that cross section and you narrowed the shoulders by four-foot or something like that, obviously that reduces the square footage, but he doesn't know if that is proportional to what the reduction of cost is going to be. Haugen responded that the reduction in cost that he has done was to take the total cost, say a \$30,000,000 bridge total cost, and just took 17% off of it. He added that he hasn't reduced the square footage for shoulder width or taking a multipurpose path off of Merrifield, he just took the difference between \$300 to \$250 off the total cost.

Grasser commented that, philosophically it pains him to think that we might go through this effort to build a bridge and not have it serve during flood time; but at some point the numbers and the dollars need to be taken into account and maybe we aren't ready to make too many steps, but if even make an incremental step, and he agrees with Mr. Powers, that maybe if we eliminate the high bridge, as much as that pains him, but from a realistic standpoint we could maybe take that step and reduce the analytical effort, so maybe we just take that step today.

Vetter said that we are looking at this on the cost side, in decreasing from \$300 to \$250 a square foot, but maybe we also need to look at the benefit side and how we came up with those numbers, are we using correct figures there or can we adjust the benefit analysis to bring those down to match cost also. Haugen responded that we are asking our two State DOTs to give us feedback on what we are using for B/C. He said that just this morning he got the cost side of it, keep hounding for the benefit side as well because ultimately they need to be comfortable with what those are as well, and give us some concurrence. He stated that they are pushing them as hard and as fast as they can, but it isn't being timely responded to.

Vein asked if they were seeing quite a bit of difference in benefit from a high versus a low; obviously we know there is more cost with a high versus a low, but is there corresponding increases in benefits. Haugen responded that there isn't, adding that they are using the exact same vehicle hours traveled savings and vehicle miles traveled savings, and they aren't showing that a high and dry bridge might give us instead of 365 days a year it will give us 360 days, we aren't messing with that we are just saying low or high. He added that benefits are the same.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THAT WE CONSIDER ONLY THE LOW BRIDGE OPTION FOR EACH CROSSING AS WE CARRY THIS ASSESSMENT FORWARD.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**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, August 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018**

b. Bill Listing For The 7/14/18 to 8/17/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the July 14, 2018 to August 17, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE AUGUST 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2018,  
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:02 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent were: Gary Malm and Warren Strandell.

Guest(s): David Kuharneko, Grand Forks Engineering

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE AUGUST 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY**

Kouba reported that the Request For Proposals is to study kind of that group of intersections, basically, between Mill Road and Washington and along Gateway. She said that there are a lot of things going on, there are a lot of conflicts going on, and so we are just trying to pull together a lot of ideas and a lot of, you know, from the smallest ones to the biggest ones making sure we are in compliance with everything that's needing to be in compliance especially with the railroad going through that area, so we are looking for approval of that.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein referred to a map and asked if the blue lines are the boundary of this study, does it go all the way over to 20<sup>th</sup> Street, northeast of 3<sup>rd</sup>. Kouba responded that that is correct, adding that because some of the cueing gets back into that far or close to those two intersections when a train is going through the intersection.

Vein said that there are going to be some changes in the train traffic through there when they do that loop up further to the north, correct. Kouba responded there will and added she doesn't know if right now that the Mill can actually get involved into that loop right now or whether or not that it is a feasible thing for them to do, but they will be trying to land unit trains at the very least in their area so if they are going to bring them up through the mill spur line, that is part of what is being looked at.

Mock asked if the study will look at the timing that they would be bringing trains through. Kouba responded that we can ask BNSF but how much they will agree to work with us on is always going to be key but they will be at the table of course.

Vein asked for a review of the timeline for the study. Kouba stated that we hope to have the study completed next year, and to have the full study done by October of next year. She added that all of the proposals will be due in October of this year.

Vein asked if there was an estimated cost for the proposals. Kouba responded that the budget is \$60,000. Vein asked how that amount was determined. Kouba responded that that is what was reserved in the work program. Vein said that he understands that but on what basis was \$60,000 versus \$100,000. Haugen responded that while it is a complex intersection it is a small focused area so based on prior intersection studies and what work is involved this is what we came up with. Vein said, then, that you used just your judgement, there isn't anything that said that depending on complexities it could be more or it could be less, but that is where you expect to be. Haugen responded that that is correct.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT RFP FOR THE SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Strandell and Malm.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CONTRACT FOR MN 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY**

Viafara reported that in July the MPO requested authorization from the Technical Advisory Committee and approval from this board to submit a Request for Proposal; and the purpose was seeking consultants assistance to advance the Minnesota 220 North Corridor Study in East Grand Forks. He said that they proceeded and the Request For Proposal was advertised through the North Dakota Department of Transportation website beginning July 18<sup>th</sup>.

Viafara stated that be August 31<sup>st</sup> we had received three proposals from qualified engineering firms; one of them was Alliant Engineering, another was KLJ Engineering and the last one was SRF. He said that those three proposals came to our attention and a committee of seven was established to review the three

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

proposals and to help the MPO with proper guidance with how to move and select one qualified consultant company.

Viafara commented that the qualified firm that was awarded the projects was Alliant Engineering, and today we are here asking you to please authorize our MPO to engage in conversations in terms of negotiations to properly advance this particular project.

Viafara stated that the estimated cost of the project is about \$70,000 and the schedule, the work is scheduled that basically would provide you with some insights of how complex, what is entailed in the advancement of the project exactly to get it to you in your packet.

Viafara commented that something important to distinguish here is that, in your packet also there is kind of a page, number 5, that tells you in a very kind of overall way, some of the concerns that have been identified initially by the consulting company of elements that will drive the overall study.

Viafara said that today the MPO is asking you to please authorize our MPO to engage in a conversation in terms of negotiating the contract for \$70,000 to study the Minnesota 220 North Corridor Study.

Grasser asked if the cost envelope had been opened. Haugen responded that it was opened. Grasser asked what the amount of their estimate was in their scope of work. Haugen responded that it was \$70,000. Grasser said that he was just curious so we are not trying to negotiate down from \$100+ thousand dollars.

Powers asked if the bikepath being constructed was part of this as well, or is this something that the City thought was necessary. Haugen responded that this is an update of a 2008 study that took place on this corridor. He stated that in the 2008 study there was a recommendation to put in that bikepath that is being constructed now. He said that we finally got the funding from the ATP City Subtarget to install it so this was part of the recommendations from the prior study that is now finally being implemented.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT WITH ALLIANT ENGINEERING TO PERFORM THE MINNESOTA 220 NORTH CORRIDOR STUDY, AT A COST NO GREATER THAN \$70,000.00.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Malm and Strandell***

**MATTER OF EGF ADA TRANSITION PLAN UPDATE**

Kouba reported that we hired SRF back in April to do the preparation of an ADA Transition Plan for the City of East Grand Forks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Kouba commented that SRF, at the end of June beginning of July, came in and did an evaluation and have been working on the standardized working of the main document itself, but the big part was their coming out and evaluating all of the public right-of-way; and they have completed that. She stated that there are some basic things that were checked for compliance and we have several; there are the curb ramps that were looked at separate, there are the sidewalks, and the accessible pedestrian signals. She said that we will take those individual things and come up with an overall compliance. She added that overall East Grand Forks is doing pretty average along the way of implementing and adhering to the ADA accessibility laws that are in place.

Kouba said that now that we have an inventory, the City can do some prioritization, and some prioritization suggestions have been made. She added that once we've talked to some focus groups as well as to get some public input on priorities for getting accessibility in place, as well as presenting to the City Council.

Grasser asked if this kind of suggests where sidewalks should go that may or may not exist, or are they only analyzing where things are existing today. Kouba responded that it is only analyzing what is in place today and accessibility of the right-of-way. Haugen added that the inventory is only what exists today. Vetter asked when the data collected, this summer or last summer. Kouba responded that it was collected at the end of June beginning of July this year. Vetter stated that most of the pedestrian traffic signals were updated last summer, so he finds it kind of funny that most of them aren't compliant. Kouba responded that most of the ones that were updated are along DeMers, and there are some along Central Avenue that are not quite compliant yet. She added that the main city one is just south of the Murray Bridge, so there are a few areas that need updating yet, but we are at 57% so we are halfway there for just the signals, but those are expensive to update as well.

Information only.

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

Haugen reported that most of this is actually, again, information and an update, however we are going to seek some action on resolutions adopting performance measures for the bridge and pavement condition and also for our traffic reliability.

Haugen stated that we are getting pretty close to the end of year, which is when we are required to have our update adopted so our we have been working to finalize that document.

Haugen commented that when it comes to performance measures, we do have the PM3s that we have been talking about most recently. He said that last month we talked about not adopting the State targets because there are some facilities that we don't have so we don't feel that we should adopt a State of Minnesota target if we don't have that facility, and the Interstate target is a prime example.

Haugen stated that when it came to coming up with a number, sometimes we are reflecting a number that is close to one of our States and other times we are reflecting a number that we adopt, a target that is more precise for the Grand Forks/East Grand Forks experience.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that in the case of Interstate Truck Travel Reliability, even though the interstate is only in North Dakota, and our targets are closer to the 1.2 or our performance so far to-date is closer to 1.2, we are, and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending that we adopt a 1.5, which is actually what the State of Minnesota adopted as their target. He added that the State of North Dakota adopted a target of 3.0, which is extreme and as we discussed at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting all of our surrounding States are even less than 1.5 so we are giving ourselves a little bit of leniency or some slack room for construction or weather, which based on this data can have up to 1.5.

Haugen stated that for the rest of Interstate Reliability North Dakota is 85%, Minnesota is 80%, and our data shows 100% today so staff is recommending 90% be the MPO Target being it is not mirroring one state or the other state, so we are trying to find a happy ground between what the States are doing and what our data is showing our performance is.

Haugen said that on the Non-Interstate Travel, here we have facilities in both States; North Dakota is at 85%, Minnesota is at 75% and our data is showing us to be closer to 85%, so we are suggesting we set a target of 85% for that.

Vein asked if, on any one of those, there is a value to trying to make sure it is attainable versus having something that is too tight, or too difficult to reach; what are we trying to really accomplish here. Haugen responded that we are trying to find that middle ground. He added that we are trying to find a target that possibly we won't be able to achieve, but if we do get to that level we have some bullets in our gun, if you will, to go to our partner agency and point out that our data is saying that we are getting below our target so we need to have a discussion about how we can get back to our target. He said, though, that if we set the target to a level where it is too easy to maintain and keep than we have less or not bullets, but if we set it so it is too hard achieve than we are shooting ourselves in the foot because we are setting an target that is unachievable. Vein asked if there would be penalties if you don't hit your targets or if you go over your targets. Haugen explained that these performance measures don't have a direct penalty clause to them like the safety measures do, or the bridge and pavement ones that we will be discussing next.

Haugen reported that also for the MPO these would be four-year targets. He pointed out that on the State side it is a two-year target, a four-year target. He explained that for the two year targets the State is required to submit a report to the feds after two years, and at that time they have the ability to adjust their target based on what their data is telling them for two years. He added that if the State adjusts their target after the two years, even though ours is four years, we are supposed to be working in close coordination with the States so if they are adjusting their target we may want to revisit our target after two years, but officially we are adopting a four-year target. Vein asked if the States have any control over what we choose. Haugen responded that it is a local decision. He added that they have been cooperatively engaging with us as we discuss this, the two States representatives at our Technical Advisory Committee meeting voted for the recommendation so there shouldn't be a problem at the State level.

Haugen said that for the PM2, just to go back to the bridge and pavement conditions; here we are either adopting or are recommending that we adopt the State's targets. He stated that he knows we don't have

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

a facility on the Minnesota side, we aren't defaulting to the States, we are ?? the North Dakota target; so the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are recommending, and in your packet are the resolutions adopting these targets. He said that they are seeking, if the board is willing to adopt these resolutions today; we do have officially until the middle of November to make a decision on these targets, however as part of our Long Range Transportation Plan, we are trying to get this included in the draft so that we will roll out here in October as a preliminary draft So that is why we are seeking a decision today.

Haugen stated that it might be appropriate to see if the board would be willing to consider adopting these two resolutions.

Vein asked if the two resolutions are included in the packet. Haugen responded they are. He referred to a slide showing the resolution template they used and explained that it has been updated to reference the specific Subpart C of CFR 490, and it identified exactly where the targets are that the Grand Forks MPO is adopting. He added that even though we are adopting these we will continue to work and to help both States achieve their targets.

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE PM2,  
PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE CONDITION PERFORMANCE TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Malm and Strandell.***

***MOVED BY VETTER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE PM3,  
NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM TARGETS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Malm and Strandell.***

Haugen reported that there is a deadline of October 1<sup>st</sup> in which we should have been adopting transit asset targets however our Transit Operators have not presented to us, and we have to work with them on reaching those target levels, so all of us will be missing that date of October 1<sup>st</sup>. He said, though, that he expects that at our next meeting we will have those targets before you for consideration.

Haugen stated that the last thing we have on this is, our current Transportation Plan does have a performance target for CO2 Emissions from the tailpipe. He said that we have updated the data to show where we've been and how we are progressing. He commented that our target in our 2040 plan was to see that by the year 2040 there was a 10% reduction in our 2007 levels. He said that between 2006 and 2010 we saw a large reduction across the board for the most part, but between 2010 and 2015 we saw a relatively substantial growth in the vehicle miles traveled compared to our last reporting period,

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

however we also had an improved mile per gallon in our vehicles, so our net effect on CO2 reduction was improved, just not as great as before. He stated that ultimately we are still making progress towards achieving this target, however our rate of reaching that target has slowed down in our last reporting period, so at our next meeting we will likely have a recommendation on how to approach this in the 2045 plan.

DeMers asked how that data is acquired. Haugen responded that it is a calculation based primarily off of the vehicle miles traveled in our metro area. He explained that the vehicle miles traveled is also a computation of each State DOT's annual traffic counts, but only at key spots, not everywhere, and then they extracted that out as to what the annual vehicle miles traveled are. DeMers said, though, that if everybody in Grand Forks bought a Prius, there would be no way for that to be reflected. Haugen responded that they go with the vehicle registrations, every vehicle has to be registered to a location, and they use that to calculate the fleet miles per gallon calculation, so they have access to the data that is there, and they mine it and come up with these statistics and so on. Vein said, though, that you could have a lot of transportation from outside the City that's going through the City. Haugen agreed, but added that it is the miles as they travel through, City miles, that they are in the MPO area that is being calculated, not if they started in Pisek. Vein commented that what he is saying is that the data wouldn't be just for Grand Forks, but you would have the number of miles for everyone going through.

Vetter asked if we were doing anything pro-actively to lower this. Haugen responded that the primary thing that we have done is implementing the Signal Coordination Plans in the past five or six years, especially on the Grand Forks side. He added that a lot of our other efforts would be when we try to add turning lanes and such to improve the flow of traffic, which in turn improves the CO2 emissions. He said that we implemented a new bus routing system and added service to that to try to drive more usage of the transit system; we are adding bike facilities, sidewalk facilities for other mode of traffic than just single occupant vehicles, so we are bits and pieces pecking away at it, however we don't have major projects that would really hit or VMT as the future bridge discussion will inform us about.

Haugen reported that the next portion of this update is on Investment Direction. He stated that a lot of our investment is actually provided to us by our Feds and States, through their planning documents and direction.

Haugen said that we did go out and get some public input, more for direction, but really our driving force is what our federal regulations and our State plans tell us, because we have to be consistent with our direction. He stated that that this is just trying to give some relationship with our goals and how they relate to the federal performance measures.

Haugen referred to a slide with diagrams showing public input results. He stated that at two separate times back in August of 2017 we were at the Empire and we also had an active website where a Wiki-Map tool was used to gather input from the public; and in January of 2018 we asked people if they had \$100 how they would split it up into these different categories, where their investments would be, and the main one was investing in maintaining our existing infrastructure.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that investment scenario is really an investment scenario that looks at state of good repair and repaving, state of good repair. He explained that it is just identifying from our revenue sources the type of investments and how it shapes out for those investments. He pointed out that this is a different way of showing where we get the revenue and how it is split between safety, state of good repair (interstate), state of good repair (non-interstate), ND Main Street, and local projects.

Haugen stated that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting last week we distributed a list of projects for the four main agencies we have. He said that since then we have been doing some adjustments to the list and we are still working on identifying what projects we have for the revenue we have available, so he isn't ready to show that list to this body at this time, but essentially all of our revenue is going into maintaining what we have per our federal emphasis in our State Plan.

Haugen reported that we did have a tool that used, and shared with the Technical Advisory Committee, and asked for input on as to all these other projects that likely won't be funded, how should they be prioritized, how should they be ranked or scored based on the goals and objectives we've drafted for this plan. He referred to a slide and pointed out that it lists the projects that rose to the top; and the only two exceptions were that we added the river crossings because we have been spending a lot of time talking about them, and because Merrifield and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue are in the current 2040 plan that is why they were identified in this list as well.

Discussion on the proposed Point Bridge Approach project ensued.

Haugen stated that the next set of slides is bringing you up-to-date on the river crossing analysis. He said that since our last meeting we talked about benefit/cost and we had questions for Polk County, and he and Warren Strandell talked on Monday and he has been talking with his board about where they sit on the Merrifield Bridge location, if they support it or not, and he said that Polk County is comfortable with the two bridge locations as currently identified in the 2040 Plan, Merrifield and 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He added that they aren't overly concerned about which one comes first, our current language has been to try to get Merrifield first and then see if we still need one at the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue location, but Polk County is flexible as to which one comes first.

Haugen said that a second question he had for Mr. Strandell was, because on the Minnesota side the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue location has some road authority issues, and would most likely road jurisdiction would be Polk County, where do they sit with this location and his response was that if that came to be the only location where an additional bridge could be sited, Polk County could rearrange its County state aid system, or add mileage and make it happen.

Haugen stated that one thing that Mr. Strandell did note though is it is conditional that we've always been, and the travel demand models would be showing that an extension of Rhinehart becomes the most traveled north/south roadway, so the County is requesting that direct linkage between 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue bridge location and Rhinehart not be allowed. He explained that Mr. Strandell feels that the Hartsville Road, is a better road to begin with even though it is a gravel road, but they feel that the Hartsville Road is a better road to try to get that north/south travel on. He added that they discussed that, yes, the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

intersection with Bygland Road was truncated when Greenway Boulevard crossed Bygland Road so even though it doesn't have a direct connection into Bygland Road the County still feels, from their perspective that would be the way that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be tied into their County Highway system.

DeMers asked how they would bypass Rhinehart Drive, build a bridge over it; you're not turning left on Rhinehart. Haugen responded that it would be like what they did on Bygland and 14<sup>th</sup> where they cul-de-saced 14<sup>th</sup> so it didn't intersect with Bygland, so the solution might be to just cul-de-sac Rhinehart. He added that there has been a lot of communication from the residents on Rhinehart desiring something like that as well.

Haugen reported that the other information is really to update you on the benefit/cost ratios based on the discussion we had at your last meeting.

Haugen referred to slides illustrating the benefit/cost information and went over them briefly.

Haugen pointed out that the first slide shows all five locations. He pointed out that they are significantly different than they were the last time you saw these. He explained that they went up, however one didn't go up quite as much as the others.

Haugen commented that the primary reason for 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue's not having a very good benefit/cost is because we are adding miles and adding miles to the travel time, while the rest of them are reducing those, but 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue is attracting enough local traffic that is traveling further and take a longer time to get around.

Haugen stated that they did hold a public open house and had our two special interest groups attend it; the Merrifield supporters were there and the Grand Forks Historical Society was there as well.

Haugen said that they did offer to the Grand Forks Alderman whose wards are along the river that if they were to hold ward meetings, that he would be open to attending and try to bring those people up to date, particularly with the river crossing issues.

Vetter commented that we made a motion last month to eliminate the high bridge options and he is wondering if we might want to do the same with the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue option as the benefit/cost ratios are so low that we are never going to get any money to do that one anyway, so he is wondering if at this point we wouldn't want to eliminate that one from our study also. Powers suggested that he would like to see the 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue option eliminated, and maybe even the Elks Drive option as well.

Vein said that he is wondering, you know we added them all so that we would get a full review of every option, and he feels that since we've gone this far doesn't it make sense to keep them in even though it feels pretty logical that it is going to fall out, that way we can tell everybody we did study every option, so maybe we should leave it in the study even though we will get probably to a result we anticipate, especially seeing these numbers. DeMers asked what work is left on this portion of the study. Haugen responded that we could take the work further and identify if there are other costs downstream that you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

want to include as the project cost in addition to what the actual bridge crossing would be in the immediate touch-down points, that would be kind of the next step. Vein commented that for Grand Forks, from a political standpoint, we've studied everything equally and we've that in there is what he is thinking. Powers asked how long you want to study it. Vein responded that when we are done with this study we will be able to, for the next five to ten years say, that we did look at that and it did not have the benefit/cost ratio that we were looking for, so it was dropped.

Grasser stated that at this point this has been more of a technical analysis, but at some point do we actually have public input; something in there that says neighborhood we are planning on putting a bridge in come and give us your input because right now he thinks it has been a little too fluffy for the neighborhoods to probably get really engaged; he thinks they got excited earlier on but now it seems like it has backed off and that public input, he is curious, is that part of this process at all. Haugen responded that that is why he is trying to set up the ward meetings with the Aldermen that are in the wards that would be affected by a bridge. Grasser asked if they would help the Ward Aldermen with direct mailings to the people that are affected along the route. Haugen responded that that would be done by the City's Public Info Department's job.

Vein reported that Mr. Grasser and himself and a number of people had discussions with the Fargo/Moorhead City Engineers on the diversion project and the impacts downstream on both the 100 Year and the 500 Year elevations, and trying to figure out what the true impacts are and if there are any litigation issues that we may need; and one of them that we kind of talked about was having a high level bridge, that one of the mitigation issues could be a high level bridge in Grand Forks somewhere, and if that is true for him that could bring one of these locations in, or at least the Merrifield location could be a high level bridge.

Grasser commented that we can identify that there are impacts downstream, .07 feet which is probably about an inch with the 100-year flood, but there's .5 feet which is probably about 7 inches with the 500-year flood. He said that they are working with the East Grand Forks City Engineer, the two City Engineers are basically working together for the most part, and they are going through an analysis right now to try to figure out the impacts to our transportation system; unfortunately when he looks at it it is probably less than his original thought, but be that as it may there are still going to be some impacts there. He added that he thinks that part of the crux of the letter is going to be that we are seeing some impacts, there should be some mitigation involved, and philosophically he thinks that is what is going to be the main topic of the letter, but following that on the transportation side, which is what Mr. Vein is talking about, they were setting the groundwork at mitigation dollars brought for a high level bridge because at roughly a 50-year flood elevation all of our bridges are closed, every one of them so we don't have a way to get back and forth, so if we can tie this back to other funding sources for mitigation, maybe we can overcome some of those additional dollar amounts in having a high level bridge, that way we always have a connection between the two communities.

Grasser stated that with that they are just kind of laying the groundwork for whatever value mitigation wise that we have, we are kind of planting that seed, and so at some point in time we may want to come back, irrespective of the dollars, and say should a bridge be a high level bridge; whether that impacts the location or not he doesn't know, but he doesn't think we should totally write it off.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein commented that they just had this conversation a few days ago so it is just brand new, but he did talk to the City of Fargo because he was on that task force that the Governor put together, and he really wanted this body to be aware that now that they have the Draft Environmental document out for review, we need to make comments if in fact there is something that needs to be done. He added that he has been supportive of flood protection, but he also wants to know what impacts there may be and anything that is negative needs to be mitigated as part of their project, and so many people would look just at the 100-year flood, and that is pretty minimal, and he doesn't have much of an issue with 7/100's, but 58/100's at the 500-year; which really surprised him because he thought that at a higher level flood there would be less of an impact than you would at the lower 100-year flood elevation, but he always felt that we needed to have freeboard, and the idea was that we would have more retention in the future that would actually enhance our level of protection, not to have it go the other direction.

Grasser said that, piggy-backing onto that, the reason it is probably elevated is, a bigger deal for us is that in general terms the 500-year flood that we had runs very close to the top of our existing levees, so if you've 7 inches on top of that now you're at the top of the levees, potentially. He added that their data says that that doesn't happen, but he is leery about that data, but in any event when we are that close to the top of levee, 7 inches is a big deal.

Vein stated, again, that this brings back the question, when we talk about bridge locations, should we not be looking at at least one location that is a high-level bridge. DeMers commented that he thinks that everybody has kind of said that the Merrifield location would be the right spot for a high-level bridge, for one thing there is little development out there so the footprint of a high-level bridge would have the least impact there, thus the least cost. DeMers stated, though, that the problem with a high level bridge, on the East Grand Forks side, and even at Merrifield, you end up with the question of how do you get to the bridge because Highway 2 goes under water goes under water before our levees do, and although he can't imagine that much water, the point is if you build a high level bridge you have to be able to get to it.

Discussion ensued.

Vein said that for the discussion today it is good to have the communication and knowledge base, but the question just comes back for this study, would we show something other than a low-level bridge at a location, because we've already decided to take them out and you only have all five locations being studied for a low-level bridge. Haugen responded that there are degrees of low, and the Merrifield one is the exception to the other locations as their approaches aren't designed to even meet the high bridge level, but the Merrifield's whole structure is designed or conceptualized to meet the high bridge level. DeMers asked what level the others are at. Haugen responded that he can't answer that off the top of his head. Vein stated that they would be similar to what we said the walk bridges are, correct. Haugen responded that conceptually that is what we are saying. DeMers said that some of those are better than the bridges; on the north end didn't they say they were going to run ambulances across there if needed. Grasser responded that they physically could but that is a lower level than the Point Bridge; he thinks they go under at the 35ish range, the Point Bridge goes under at the 44ish range, the Sorlie goes under at the 45ish range, and the Kennedy goes under at the 50ish range.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein stated that what he heard is that the bridge itself, the structure itself is high enough even though it is listed as a low level bridge; the approaches on both sides, and again where you connect into all of that would be tied into that, so would you have to do road raises just so that it doesn't go under water, you would have to have it usable or it wouldn't do either community any good unless it can connect to something. DeMers agreed, adding that that is why 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, if you went high or low is pretty much the end for East Grand Forks, and Merrifield is the end for Grand Forks.

Vein commented that he would think there would be two advantages for a high bridge; one would be the connection between the two communities, and the other would be the transportation system of potentially Highway 2 through town and continue to go east; we need to have some of that because otherwise that closes that off, although we do have the advantage of being able to go down to the Thompson Bridge.

Grasser asked if the study indicated; you said Merrifield tied into a Minnesota Highway, is that Highway dry then at the 100-year event. Haugen responded that it was dry. Grasser asked if it was dry by a lot. Haugen responded that part of that was also the diversion of Cole Creek and using fill from a diversion ditch.

Vein commented that this is helpful for him to be somewhat aware of the Merrifield bridge having the capability of being a high bridge and to be able to leave the rest of the options having a low bridge.

Haugen stated that at some point we will need direction on how to write up the plan; again, the current plan says that "not for construction purposes, but to preserve the right-of-way, etc. to prevent development, hinging on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue or Merrifield Road"; that is how the current write up is and if we are going to change that we need to know how to write that in the plan, but if you're going to keep it that way they will just carry over that language. Vein said that the one question he did want to bring up today was, from a timeline perspective where and at what meeting is this decision going to get made. Haugen responded that the timeline, working backwards from the end of December, so at your December MPO Board meeting is when we would anticipate this body adopting the Long Range Transportation Plan, to get to that point we submit it to both City Council's for their consideration as an amendment into their City Planning Documents, in order for that to happen we have to get it to them in October, so at your next board meeting it is our hope that we will have a draft plan for you to give preliminary approval to and then we would push that out for it's 60-day comment period and consideration by both cities. He added that we also be going to both counties, which we haven't done in the past to get some incorporation of our document into their county plans. He explained that in going through each City's process and public hearings for consideration of the document for each city plan, however they do it, and then in December you will have all that action and comment coming back to you to adopt a final document.

Vein said that for him there are two critical times, when the MPO Board itself makes a recommendation and then when it is final at the end of December; and he thought he heard that a draft plan recommendation will be submitted to the MPO Board at its next meeting. Haugen responded that that is their hope, that is what they are working diligently towards. Mock asked if it goes to the City Councils

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

before you make that recommendation, or does it go through this body before it goes to the councils. Haugen responded that it would go through this body before it gets formally presented for each City to consider it as an amendment into their City Planning document. Mock asked what happens if the City Councils don't agree with what this body is recommending. Haugen responded that that has happened in the past; this body adopts a plan; each council adopts a plan; for federal purposes the plan that this body adopts is the plan that must be consistent.

Vein commented that we will see what happens, if we approve one thing; we've studied this before and now we've studied it again, and it is more of a political decision and we are just going to have to have a way to move forward. DeMers added that the difference is that both Cities have grown to the south even more, we just keep moving further south. Vetter stated that it is actually getting to be less and less of a political issue because the impacts on our infrastructure is getting more and more, and the bridges have gotten bad ratings and if we don't do something they will be in the "F" category so we have to do something, it is to the point now where we can't just sit back and say, well we'll wait five years until we update our plan again and then it will still be out in the 40-year plan, it can't be in the 40-year plan anymore it's got to be in the 10-year plan because traffic patterns are affected on both sides of the river.

Grasser said that when you build a bridge it is going to be here forever, essentially, and the cost/benefit ratios, he is assuming are based on the 2040 Land Use Plan, and he would think that travel demands and things like that would be in there, is there any way of projecting out; as the City's both grow south those cost/benefit ratios are going to change, maybe favoring more the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Merrifield both, he doesn't know, but is there a value, should we look at what these benefits or these cost benefit ratios might theoretically be in 100-years. He stated that we are catching a point in time as we are growing south. Haugen responded that that is correct, but added that just so you are aware, in the East Grand Forks Land Use Plan, even at 2045 they don't show development much past 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. DeMers commented that that is without a bridge in there though. Kouba commented that she believes they did look at briefly, and even with a bridge it wouldn't go out that far. Haugen added that they also are promoting development to the north out by the golf course as well.

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. Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Plan Update

Haugen reported that the board authorized the Finance Committee to take action on the Grand Forks Downtown Transportation Study, and they did meet and did execute a contract with KLJ. He explained that it is more of a parking and special event parking management study, so that is about to get underway.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

c. 2019-2020 Annual Unified Work Program Project Solicitation

Haugen reported that next month we will also be presenting to you our next two year work program which will identify what studies and activities we will be doing so hopefully if you have any ideas for projects you will contact your City Staff to get that through your processes.

d. Bill Listing For The 7/14/18 to 8/17/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the August 17, 2018 to September 14, 2018 July 14, 2018 to August 17, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:15 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:02 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

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.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF MPO OFFICE SPACE LEASE AGREEMENTS**

Haugen reported that at the end of this year our current lease agreements with both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks City Halls expire. He stated that we have negotiated renewal of both for 2019; on the Grand Forks Side we are exercising an option to renew the existing lease with a small increase in the square foot cost, and on the East Grand Forks side we are adding another twelve months to the current document at the same per square foot cost we currently identify in our agreement with East Grand Forks.

Haugen said that, as the staff reports indicates, and as reported to you previously, there is still some discussion of the benefits of moving staff to the Herald Building. He explained that the Finance Committee discussed this option, but agreed that since it could still be some time before a final decision is made on the Herald Building, and also the fact that even if the decision is to move staff to the Herald Building it could take some time before the space is ready, it made sense to negotiate another year lease with both Cities for our current space, which is what staff has done. He added that both leases do have a termination clauses that can be exercised with prior notice.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Grasser asked, if the Herald Building option comes about; and he knows that there would be an increase in the cost of space rental, how would we handle the financial side if that if we terminated these leases that we are talking about now, how would we make up that difference. Haugen responded that we would have to do an amendment to our Work Program if the cost increase is large enough, but right now we don't know the potential rental cost for the Herald will actually be, but he believes the Finance Committee has indicated that if the Planning and Community Development Departments move to the Herald Building, they felt that the MPO would lease some space there as well, however we aren't sure how much space at this time, but if all works out and we increase the space considerably, and don't reduce the space here in East Grand Forks, we would have to possibly do a Work Program amendment. Grasser said that that isn't too onerous of a process, so that is good.

Vein commented that Todd Feland, Grand Forks City Administrator, was present at the Finance Committee meeting and was part of that discussion and motion that came out of that meeting. He added that Mr. Feland is the person that has been the driving force in pushing and moving forward with the potential of moving to the Herald Building, beyond just the MPO, as well.

***MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE 2019 LEASE AGREEMENTS WITH BOTH GRAND FORKS AND EAST GRAND FORKS, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Kouba reported that although we did approve the final Transit Development Plan Update in July 2017, a few changes have occurred that need to be addressed. She explained that the biggest change was that the Cities Area Transit received a Competitive Grant award to do an expansion and update to their bus facilities. She said that the difference between the amount we showed in our plan and the amount actually awarded has initiated this amendment, but with it there is also a need to include the performance based planning and programming that is now required as well, including safety and transit asset management.

Kouba stated that with this we have updated the plan to include these changes, and made sure to highlight what was changed in addition to the bus facilities such as some of the additional candidate projects that were moved from being candidate projects to having been funded, as well as a few new candidate projects. She said that there were also some operational funding changes because of the new bus routes that have been implemented as well.

Kouba said that a public hearing was scheduled for today's meeting.

Vein opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Vein closed the public hearing.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO THE TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN FINANCIAL CHAPTER, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF AMENDMENT TO THE 2019-2022 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that, again, because of the Nationwide Competitive Award of the 5339 Grant of \$3.6 million dollars to the Cities Area Transit we have to amend it into our T.I.P. document so this action will be that formal process.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that it included the project listing detailing the amended amount into the T.I.P. He explained that because of performance based planning and programming, after October 1<sup>st</sup> we had to address how our T.I.P. is including it so you have a very similar write-up in our T.I.P. document that followed the framework we did for the Safety Performance Measures.

Haugen commented that we also advertised today's meeting as a public hearing. He said that they did ask that any verbal or written comments be submitted prior to this meeting and received none, so both the Technical Advisory Committee and Staff are recommending approval of the amendment.

Vein opened the public hearing.

There was no one present for discussion.

Vein closed the public hearing.

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE FY2019 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR FTA 5339 GRANT SOLICITATION**

Kouba reported that this is a grant that is a yearly grant, but in August they reopened it for project solicitation and the deadline is October 19<sup>th</sup> and Cities Area Transit has several projects that they have submitted for consideration and the Grand Forks City Council did approve them in the priority order

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

shown in the staff report; however a change to that order was requested by Cities Area Transit to bring the heavy duty buses up to priority #5 and moving the other projects down one number. She pointed out that the requested change is shown in red, and was approved by the Technical Advisory Committee subject to the City Council being notified of the change request.

Vein stated that a question that comes to his mind is, obviously there are ten items on this list, what is the likelihood of any of them getting funded, and how far down that list would that go. Kouba responded that it depends upon; generally when we look at it we look at the top three or four projects as having a higher likelihood of being funded, but it also depends upon how many other entities submit projects, and whether or not there is local match available, so they are looking at our urban properties so Fargo and Bismarck could also have projects that they are putting in for as well.

Vein asked what the reason for moving the heavy duty buses up was. Kouba responded that possible contracts with UND, as UND would then be covering the local match for those buses, but there are still discussions going on as to whether or not the Cities Area Transit will be taking on the UND Shuttle service. Vein said that this would get us in position to do that but doesn't guarantee it because it is far enough down the list that it may not be funded. Kouba responded that that is correct.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE CITIES AREA TRANSIT 5339 GRANT APPLICATION IN THE PRIORITY ORDER GIVEN.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY DRAFT PLAN**

Haugen reported that included in the staff report was the section of our By-Laws that indicate that in order to meet our end of December timeline we need to allow both Cities and others to consider and give feedback on a preliminary document, and in order to do that today would be the day that we would need to seek that preliminary approval from the board.

Haugen stated that he does have a power point, as well as some new information that was received since the packet was sent out that he did distribute. He said that he won't be going through everything that you have seen before, but just to give you some updates.

Haugen commented that he thinks this is important because it is a five-year cycle, and as we finish this five-year cycle, and have action later on in December, it isn't too much further down the road that we will start up the whole cycle again.

Presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) ensued.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen stated that our investment direction, taking on from federal law, we emphasis preservation, we emphasis facilities serving national and regional transportation. The next slide presented information about erosion of purchasing power. He stated that, we have shown this in previous adoptions of plans, but this tells us that as projects get pushed out further purchasing power erodes and our rate of inflation of the expenditures rises faster than our revenue growth. He said, though, not to paint such a bleak picture, this planning document has significant more revenue in it than our 2040 planning document does, so that gap is lessened a bit because of that. He added that one of the major reasons on the Minnesota side is the City Sub-target that East Grand Forks gets every fourth year has substantially increased since our 2040 document, and also MnDOT itself has seen a need to do investments in our region that our 2040 plan did not contain, and the third major increase was the City of Grand Forks' additional sales tax, so we do have some additional revenue but there still is that erosion of purchasing power as things get moved down the road.

Vein commented that, we don't know what is going to happen, but the legislature has proposed additional funding for infrastructure projects, and that can go a number of different directions, but he would think that there would probably be some that will be geared toward street and highway systems too; and even though we don't know what that is now, six to eight months from now, after the session, we should have some idea and we might have to come back and make some adjustment, is that correct. Haugen responded that we identified that either State Legislature might give us more revenue to work with, Congress itself might give us more revenue, the FAST-ACT expires in 2020, so even our T.I.P. document goes out to 2022 with the potential to having to change the fiscal constraint, so there are a lot of different reasons we would have to reopen this than our typical five-year process.

Haugen commented that for our investment scenarios he will just focus on those projects that we know to-date.

Presentation continued.

Haugen reported that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting staff provided a list of projects, and the Committee recommended some modifications be made to that list. He referred to a slide showing a map of the North Dakota Urban Local Roads Program for City Streets in Grand Forks that are on the federal aid system, and went over it briefly. He pointed out that all of the green are roadways that are covered by this, and then the two NHS segments are also covered by this program, the first one is the stretch of Columbia Road and the other is the small stretch of South Washington Street, otherwise this Urban Road Program is meant to have funds focused on the green roadways identified on the North Dakota side of this map.

Haugen referred to the project list and pointed out that you can see that the Technical Advisory Committee action is noted, and it shows that at that time there was roughly \$10 million dollars unidentified in the mid-term, and \$6 million dollars in the long-term. He then referred to the project list he distributed and went over the changes that Grand Forks City Staff submitted for consideration.

Haugen commented that another thing that they received after the Technical Advisory Committee meeting is a request from the NDDOT District Office to consider changing a stretch of Gateway Drive.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

He explained that previously this stretch of Gateway Drive is under the NDDOT's system described as being out at by the Air Force Base to essentially 55<sup>th</sup> Street in Grand Forks, and they describe it as two miles west of Columbia Road, which is 55<sup>th</sup> Street out to the Air Force Base and they now want us to consider for a mile between 55<sup>th</sup> and 69<sup>th</sup>, a roughly \$10 million dollar reconstruction to urbanize that mile stretch. He said that they have some other savings, or project scoping going on with other projects, and they are still working with NDDOT on identifying, because of the fiscal constraint issue, where that \$10 million dollars can be freed up for replacement projects, or how we are going to treat this.

Haugen said that these are the changes that have happened since the Technical Advisory Committee meeting; and they still need to work with staff on these two main issues on the document itself. He stated that, back to Mr. Vein's earlier point about the additional money that came in; right now these are the ones that rose to the top of our prioritization tool that we used to prioritize that universe list of projects. He said that the exception, as he described last time you saw this, and that is still the same are river crossings, which were not prioritized in that tool; they are just showing from the current 2040 plan in two locations.

Haugen reported that just to update you on the river crossings the five sites are 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Elks Drive, 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, and Merrifield. He reminded everyone that the last information we discussed was the benefit/cost ratios, and since then there have been some meetings with various bodies and groups, and these handouts illustrate those discussions. He added that staff met with both City Planning Commissions but did not ask them to take any action, but did inform them that we hope to be asking them to take action in November. He stated that as part of that presentation they did receive some feedback from the Planning Commissioners. He added that they also went to two different meetings with the Grand Forks Wards, the first one was Ward 5, which is the south side from 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue southward. He said that they met on October 10<sup>th</sup> and almost all those attending were from the 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue area so the feedback they got was what is shown on the slide; and then on October 15<sup>th</sup> they met with Wards 3 and 4 and had a mixture of people from the Minnesota 4<sup>th</sup> area and some representing the Historical Society property, and again they voiced support but no formal action was taken at any of these meetings; and so they just heard what they heard.

Vetter commented that the thing that he thought was interesting was that no one there opposed the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue crossing.

Powers asked how well advertised these meetings were. Haugen responded that the ward meetings themselves they utilized the City's Public Info Center and so he knows they went on a media blitz including social media, newspaper print, radio, commentary, WDAZ, etc. He said that for the Planning and Zoning Commission meetings were advertised using their standard public notification process, and on the North Dakota side it is televised, but not on the East Grand Forks side, that is the one meeting that isn't televised.

Haugen reported that a lot of those meetings started out with a history of what was done; and just highlighting that and as we've discussed, at some point out draft needs to either change what the current documents have been stating for the last three iterations, or just continue on with what they say; but the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

question is we've gone through a lot of analysis, does that really change what the current document is saying. He added that as staff, he doesn't see where there has been any new information that would dramatically change the support for 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield.

Haugen commented that the last few slides were in the packet already and just give a month by month what meeting is scheduled when, and what type of action is necessary. He added that in the middle of November they are scheduled to give presentations to the upper management for both DOTs, so they will get a full briefing of the whole planning process at that time. Vein asked where this will take place at. Haugen responded that the Minnesota one will be taking place in Baxter, MN on November 14<sup>th</sup>, which is also the day of our Technical Advisory Committee meeting so we will actually be video conferencing in to their scheduled meeting; the NDDOT meeting will be in Bismarck but it is yet to be scheduled. He added that they are working with all the different calendars to try to find a date, but we are asking them to consider it in the middle of November so that we have feedback from both State DOTs before December ends.

Haugen stated that we are seeking preliminary approval for the draft plan so that we can formally start that review process. He said that they will work with the two remaining issues that are still out there; and figure out with the Urban Road Program and switching the projects and then with the regional program whether or not we can take in that \$9 or \$10 million dollar project, what projects can get shuffled somewhere else.

Vein asked, if we have approval to move that on do we have to have some decision, or at least preliminary approval of those to move them forward. Haugen responded that that would be the board's discretion; his opinion is it is a couple of projects here or there and he doesn't know if we will be able to shake all those out now with giving time for staff to react to them, but the dollar numbers are what they are so that is the constraint that is really there.

Grasser commented that his opinion is, they ran it through the Technical Advisory Committee and there were a number of changes and things, and he would move it ahead with the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation because they knew that there needed documents but it was a way of moving the process through without delay. He explained that Michael Johnson, NDDOT, expressed concern about meeting deadlines, and with the schedule we can't let too much slip so he thinks it is something that we can work on between now and the next cycle of Technical Advisory Committee and MPO Board meetings. He added that we had preliminary approval at the October 10<sup>th</sup> Technical Advisory Committee, but the schedule shows that the November meeting will be an informational meeting, so he is wondering if the Technical Advisory Committee would be making a recommendation for final approval of the plan in November or December. Haugen responded that final approval would be requested in December. He added that in October we are hoping that we get all of the technical review by the 23<sup>rd</sup>, which would mean that by October 23<sup>rd</sup> we resolve these two outstanding issues; what the Urban Road list will look like and what the Regional Road list will look like so that when we present to the Planning and Zoning Commission ten days prior to their meeting we can say that this is the document that we are asking them to adopt. He added that, again, preliminary approval in November so that there are modifications that still take place, iterations that will still take place, and hopefully we aren't completely off and have to do a widespread changes, that there is more finetuning, and then in December we will grand final approval of the document.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY DRAFT PLAN, AS PRESENTED.***

Grasser stated that one key thought, from his perspective, is that he thinks that with the action of the Technical Advisory Committee and with his interpretation of some of the language in the documents it does preserve the ability for the local governments to determine projects and prioritizations for 100% local dollar projects, and he thinks that is important. He added that at this point in time he thinks it does, and maybe he should have asked this question before he made the motion, but does it carry all the bridges or only the 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield bridges. Haugen responded that the way the draft is written now it would only include the 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield bridges because those are what are in the current plan. He added that the only slight alteration on the 100% local projects, if there is federal action that is needed on those 100% local projects, they will need to show up in the Plan as well, there is still that caveat to that.

Powers asked again if it is just 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield that are being continued in the plan. Haugen responded that from their perspective there wasn't anything that really substantially created new information to cause a change to those two. Vein added that he thinks we did due diligence, we went and restudied all the options, looked at the cost/benefit ratios, and the Technical Advisory Committee recommended keeping it at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Merrifield and that is what is before us for consideration today, so if we are going to recommend any change to that we would need to have that discussion or we need to support the motion as it stands.

Strandell commented that when the subject of a high bridge comes up, to him it would make more sense to build two low bridges than one high bridge; for the cost of a high bridge you can get two low bridges, and for a flood that will upset things for a week or ten days every ten to twenty years does it make sense to build a high bridge. Powers stated that, and correct him if he is wrong, but the meeting that Mr. Strandell was unable to attend he made a motion that we consider only low bridges.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: None.***

**OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. 2018 Annual Work Program Project Update

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

- b. Solicitation Of Transportation Alternative Projects For Both States And SR2S In Minnesota

Haugen reported that solicitation is open for Transportation Alternative Projects for both States. He added that solicitation is also open for SR2S projects in Minnesota as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

- c. MnDOT CAV Workshop October 22<sup>nd</sup> At 5:00 P.M.

Haugen reported that next Monday, here, MnDOT is holding a Connected Automated Vehicle Workshop so if you have the ability Monday night to spend some time please consider registering for that.

- d. Bill Listing For The 9/15/18 to 10/12/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the September 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

- e. Kennedy Bridge Status

Strandell asked what the status is on the Kennedy Bridge completion. Grasser responded that they are running three crews on there now to do the painting, but it is going to be weather dependent on whether or not they finish this year or not; it is possible we can finish this year, but in any event by mid-November or so, certainly before Thanksgiving is what he is hearing, they will take down the barriers and stuff and open it up so it will be a full four-lane bridge this winter whether it is finished or not, so the question will be whether they have to come back in the spring and finish up the painting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY MALM, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO ADJOURN THE OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:39 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

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

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the November 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 17<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MALM, TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 17<sup>TH</sup>, 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 15<sup>th</sup>. 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 10<sup>th</sup> 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 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 5<sup>th</sup>, 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 13<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,  
Office Manager

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Conference Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Ken Vein, Chairman, called the December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:01 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

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

Absent: Bob Rost.

Guest(s) present: Michael Huot, Property Owner.

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

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Vein declared a quorum was present.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE NOVEMBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2018, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2018 HOLIDAY HOURS**

Haugen reported that, again, the MPO strives to match the City of Grand Forks' benefits and this is an annual benefit that they give their employees, and the MPO has annually followed suit so we do need to have the Policy Board annually take action on this as well.

Haugen stated that this is a four-hour holiday bonus that is to be used by the end of June, and is used at the discretion of both the employee and the Director.

Vein commented that they City of Grand Forks has been doing this for City employees and MPO employees for quite a while.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE 2018 FOUR-HOUR HOLIDAY BONUS FOR MPO EMPLOYEES.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Rost.*

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF 2019 MNDOT STATE PLANNING CONTRACTS**

Haugen reported that this is, again, annual agreements that we have with MnDOT. He said that if you would look at our work program we receive around \$11,000 from the State of Minnesota for our MPO.

Haugen stated that in our work program we also identify that the City of East Grand Forks has to show that they are providing the 20% match to these State monies, so that is in our work program.

Haugen commented that we also need to have a resolution adopted by the MPO authorizing the execution of the contract, and a copy of that resolution is included in the packet.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO APPROVE AUTHORIZING THE CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE THE ANNUAL MNDOT STATE PLANNING AGREEMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Rost.*

Mock reported present at 12:05 p.m.

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY PLAN ELEMENT**

Haugen reported that in the packet was a report that was updated as of last Friday as to what action was taken by what bodies. He said that since then the Grand Forks City Council met on Monday and East Grand Forks City Council met on Tuesday.

Haugen stated that we have received action now from all of our respective member jurisdictions on what they have considered on the 2045 Street and Highway Element, and what actions they have taken on it.

Haugen said that the step the MPO Board will be making today is to adopt a Resolution finalizing the 2045 Street and Highway Element. He added that there is an ability for amendments to be made to it, however currently there are no amendments for you to consider.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein stated that, procedurally all six bodies have taken action on this, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that we have received a motion from six different bodies; both City Councils, both County Commissions, and both City Planning Commissions. Vein said that the only issue was a proposed bridge at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South, and what is happening with that; and he knows that the Grand Forks County and Grand Forks Planning and Zoning Commission, who just make recommendations to the Grand Forks City Council, both gave their own motions, correct. Haugen responded that that is correct. He explained that Grand Forks County made a motion to only address the Merrifield Bridge location, and so their motion only included their agreement on a bridge at the Merrifield location and they took no action on a bridge location within the City of Grand Forks. Vein said, then, that that was neither a yes or no, it was just no action on an internal bridge, but they approved everything else. Haugen responded that that is correct, adding that they stayed silent on a location within the City. He reported that the Grand Forks Planning Commission adopted a motion stating that that they agree with the Merrifield location, but to delete all references to a location inside the City. He added that the Grand Forks County vote was unanimous, and the Grand Forks Planning vote was six to one.

Vein said that procedurally, if the Grand Forks City Council hadn't approved a bridge location at 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue that would that have modified the study to a degree because we would not have that as an avenue for the future for getting between the two communities; would that have required us to do somewhat of a rewrite of the plan. Haugen responded that it wouldn't have required a substantial rewrite of the plan; the action this body takes would have dictated what the rewrite would be. He added that we will note that the Grand Forks City Planning Commission adopted this motion; it will be added into the draft that is currently there, but if all bodies did that we would have to rewrite that section of the report more significantly.

Grasser referred to the Resolution, the fifth Whereas, and stated that we are at final approval of the Street and Highway Element but we are still at the preliminary approval stage of the Bike/Ped Element yet all three elements are listed here, is that a problem. Haugen responded that we are only approving the Street and Highway Element, however the Long Range Transportation Plan is comprised of those three elements: transit; street and highway, which we are taking final action on today; and bike/ped, which we are taking preliminary action on today and final action next month. He added that next month there will be a resolution that mentions all three of those elements being included in the Executive Summary document. Grasser asked if we should be waiting to do the Resolution at our next meeting. Haugen responded that we adopt each element separately. Grasser said, though, that this one says "Whereas, the metropolitan transportation plan...accounts for all travel modes in the four sections of the plan: Street and Highway, Transit, Pedestrian, and Bicycle, so are we just referencing that, so we aren't approving, the Whereas is not going to be part of it. Haugen responded that we are just referencing those elements.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE ADOPTING THE 2045 STREET/HIGHWAY ELEMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF NORTH DAKOTA CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR 2020-2023  
T.I.P.**

a. Transportation Alternative Projects

Viafara reported that the City of Grand Forks Engineering Department is seeking funding from the Transportation Alternative Program for two projects:

- 1) South Columbia Road (40<sup>th</sup> Avenue South to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South) – Important segment because it improves the conditions around the neighborhood, in particular around the Discovery School. It enhances access and mobility for those walking and biking to school, improves safety, and reduces points of conflict for different kinds of users.
- 2) University Avenue (Mobile Home Park to North 48<sup>th</sup> Street) – Important segment because it creates a safe walking and biking environment for students, commuters and others.

Viafara commented that these projects are also supported by local agencies, including Safe Route To School, Safe Kids Grand Forks, Parks and Recreation, Users Group, etc.; thus staff is requesting approval of these two projects.

Vein stated that Mr. Grasser and himself have talked about the South Columbia Road project; getting the street in and this would be the next logical step with that project. He added, though, that he sees the dashed line that goes further west on 47<sup>th</sup>, that will be at a later time he would assume, when there is more development, so it seems to him to make perfect sense to do this portion now. Grasser added that actually they committed, if you remember some discussion on Columbia Road, there was a discussion about whether that bikepath go in with the road or not, and the City Council basically decided that because there was no destination at that time it didn't make sense to put it in and then have the uncertainties of possibly having to remove pieces of it out as development occurred, and there is still a fair amount of undeveloped area out there, but there is a logical destination point when they reconstructed 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South they put in a bikepath, so now if you get to that point you have a continuation of a path, so he would suggest that if this doesn't get approved for State monies the City may have to move ahead at a local level to fulfill that promise that was made.

DeMers referred to the South Columbia project and stated that obviously there is the proposed one, but then there is the future one; does the future one account for any possible changes to that corridor if you're looking to get to 47<sup>th</sup>, or are you going to take it as it comes. Grasser responded that, he can only speak to the engineering side of that, it is difficult to put in a path if you don't have a road attached to it so to him there would be two issues that would go with that; 1) Is there a road and 2) What type of road is it because if they decide to put in a temporary rural asphalt road in there then it would be a more difficult decision on whether a bikepath should be put in with it because then when they put in an urban section it would probably be torn out, so those are the kind of unknowns right now, they do have plans to extend 47<sup>th</sup> in their 6-year CIP, so assuming that comes together then it would happen in the relatively near-term future. Grasser added that they would have an even more expensive issue to deal with if the 47<sup>th</sup> Interchange isn't on the dock and ready to go as to when and what kind of road they will build, and that is why he mentions there is the possibility they may put in a temporary asphalt instead.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVE CANDIDATE PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Rost.*

Haugen commented that, just to follow up on the Transportation Alternative Projects, what happens now is that we will submit them to the NDDOT and there is a Governor's Task Force that will review them and make a recommendation to the Director as to which projects should be considered for funding. He stated that on the Transportation Alternative Program there is a task force that reviews and makes a recommendation; the Urban Grant, which is the Main Street Program, there is also a task force that makes a recommendation; but the rest of these programs are pretty much internal DOT with MPO cooperative process, but those other two are unique in that they have an outside group that makes recommendations.

Vein asked if that task force is developed through the DOT. Haugen responded it was. Vein asked if we have ever been on any of those task forces. Haugen responded that the MPO Director's is a group and every two years they rotate the chair, and so every two years the current residing MPO chair will serve on those task forces.

b. HSIP Projects

Haugen reported that this is the Highway Safety Improvement Program. He explained that this is one of those that the State works more internally on the decision making.

Haugen stated that the application that they received is from the City of Grand Forks and is for materials only, so that is why the dollar value is fairly low at \$10,000. He explained that these projects do have to be coming from the Local Road Safety Program document, and these projects do come from that.

Haugen said that there are two locations, two intersections on South Washington; 48<sup>th</sup> and 44<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, to have the Red Light Conformation Lights installed. He explained that what those are are a little light, usually a blue light, that extends off of the mast and it turns on when the red light turns on so one law enforcement can be down stream and observe the light come on and know that any vehicle crossing through that intersection has run a red light; thus eliminating half the staffing that is typically needed for red light running.

Haugen stated that these are becoming more of a common element on all traffic signals being installed in Grand Forks, and we will start seeing them being proposed and installed in East Grand Forks as well.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE HSIP CANDIDATE PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Rost.*

c. Urban Grant Projects

Haugen reported that this is the other program that has a task force that makes a recommendation. He said that it was created essentially last year for the first time and the 2045 Plan you just adopted does have a list of candidate projects to go for this new revenue source.

Haugen stated that the City of Grand Forks is submitting an application to reconstruct North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, between DeMers Avenue and University Avenue, and that is one of the projects that we identified in the 2045 Street/Highway Element for this revenue source.

Haugen commented that the application is included in the packet and the City is, beside reconstructing the street, adding on some of those street enhancement that work off the DeMers Avenue reconstruction project and the landscape design that is being done there, so it is working with the Downtown Action Plan activity that is taking place in the City of Grand Forks.

Powers said that he thought the bulb-outs were eliminated. Grasser responded that when you go out to the public for discussion bulb-outs are generally liked everywhere; how they are interpreting the action of the City Council is that there is support for bulb-outs except on the State Highway itself. He explained that DeMers Avenue is getting bulb-outs on the side streets, but not on DeMers; so with that philosophy, and there was some discussion even at the City Council about the fact that bulb-outs can work other places they just don't want them on DeMers; so that is why they are incorporating that thought process in the application. Vein added that Mr. Grasser is right, so even on the DeMers project they exist on the side street but not on DeMers itself.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE URBAN GRANT PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

*Voting Nay: None.*

*Abstain: None.*

*Absent: Rost.*

d. Urban Regional Roads Projects

Haugen reported that this is another unique solicitation that took place this year. He explained that the regional road system in North Dakota are essentially State Highways in Grand Forks. He said that under the normal process each year we solicit candidate projects for the new year that is being added to the

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

rolling four years, this year however the NDDOT has notified that the Urban Regional Program is maxed out in the current T.I.P. and S.T.I.P., and so they closed the applications for candidate projects for this year's go-around; however there were a couple of exceptions in urgent situations for phasing of projects.

Haugen commented that the City of Grand Forks and the NDDOT Grand Forks District did submit a couple of projects. He stated that the first project is a NEPA document for the congestion on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. He explained that that application was submitted last year and is being submitted again for consideration, with the Year 2020 being the year identified in the application.

Haugen referred to the second page of the worksheet included in the packet that the action that the Technical Advisory Committee took was to recommend the candidate projects as submitted by the City Council of Grand Forks as consistent with the MTP and to give them priority ranking; however the NDDOT staff indicated that that really isn't the proper application format for the NEPA document to be processed, and you will notice that the two nay votes that occurred were from the NDDOT representatives, so that is something that you will have to consider, and Mr. Johnson is on the phone to answer any questions you may have about the NDDOT process.

Haugen explained that the process the NDDOT prefers is, in the S.T.I.P. they have a catch-all line item for preliminary engineering and if the NDDOT decides to go forward with the NEPA document that is where they will make their decision from, from that S.T.I.P. line item and so we have a uniqueness of having a request before us that is probably not the correct process to submit it to the State on that particular item.

Haugen stated that the second project that was submitted is a chip seal project that would be considered one of those phase projects that is part of the exception. He said that we know that there will be a mill and overlay done on North 5<sup>th</sup> Street in 2020 and this would be the phase to add a chip seal on top of that overlay. He added that the dollar amount is minor, \$45,000, and isn't going to upset the fiscal balance much.

Haugen reported that there wasn't a scoping worksheet, as we identified, last year and in our current S.T.I.P. and T.I.P. there is an illustrative project to upgrade the majority of the traffic signals, and again that was not programmed to have funding, and it is being requested that we continue to carry that as an illustrative project for the Year 2022 in our T.I.P.

Haugen stated that the NDDOT always asks for a heads-up on what might be the regional project in the next go-around; so these aren't formally being requested, but they give a heads up and our basic job is to say that it is consistent with our plans and there were two projects that were submitted; one would be the follow-up of addressing the congestion on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue; and then the other project, the congestion on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue wasn't in our transportation plan, the other project that was submitted was reconstruction of South Washington between Hammerling and DeMers, and that project is consistent with our Long Range Transportation Plan, but we aren't taking formal action on those today.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that the big issue today is whether this is the proper process for the NEPA candidate project or not. He added that, again, with the split vote the Technical Advisory Committee is saying that they recommend it is the proper process but the NDDOT partner is saying that it really isn't the proper process.

Grasser stated that he wasn't at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, and he is wondering, are they suggesting that instead of calling it NEPA they should call it Preliminary Engineering. Vein asked if Mr. Johnson could respond to Mr. Grasser's question. Johnson responded that he has been trying to find some additional information on this issue; but with any project related to the Interstate the Department typically initiates them internally. He explained the process the DOT follows for these types of projects, and how they determine how they will be funded.

Vein said that the question he might ask is; from a City of Grand Forks perspective this is an important and critical project for the future, especially if you look at the impacts not only to the Interstate System but to the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue System and the rest of the roadway system as well; is there an avenue that we have to stress the importance of at least getting this study started and done outside of having it added to this list, as he is sure that is what we would like to do, we want the DOT to understand that this is a very important project for our community and we want to make sure that that message is passed on. Johnson responded that there are several avenues that you can take. He said that you can, if you want to, as part of this process, write a letter of support from the MPO and/or the Board itself to both government divisions, or you can work through your Technical Advisory Committee to have them study that method as well.

Grasser commented that, just to give a little background, the City of Grand Forks has been experiencing congestion and accident problems on 32<sup>nd</sup> and as part of recognizing that the MPO did an I-29 Study a couple years back and based on that they found that we can't solve the issues on 32<sup>nd</sup> based on basically adding lanes to 32<sup>nd</sup> south, so the alternative that was identified was to do an improvement that isn't actually on 32<sup>nd</sup>, which was the Interchange on 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He said that he thinks Mr. Johnson perfectly described why this request doesn't fit into any of the categories; because, yes it is on the Interstate but it is really an action to resolve a State Highway issue on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue South. He added that the problem on the City side is that we are growing basically right up to that 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue South location, so we need to decide, this is a really big issue relative to cost and infrastructure and things as to how we proceed on that boundary line. He commented that they submitted an application, and it didn't rise to the top, so the question is how do we make sure that we push that urgency to the NDDOT, and there are a number of other ways to do that, and he isn't sure we shouldn't be following multiple ways as Mr. Johnson suggested, but he thinks that from the MPO standpoint, and from the City's standpoint we want to do what the Technical Advisory Committee said and push this to the DOT, but it creates an uncomfortable situation, and is maybe a little out of the normal line, but it is an actual item all the way to the top levels of decision making and he thinks given the critical importance of timing for the City of Grand Forks he thinks we have to take that unprecedented step, and he thinks the Technical Advisory Committee basically agreed with that with the exception of some of the DOT folks.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein asked Mr. Johnson, after hearing how important this study is, if there is a negative to the community or to this request if we incorporate it in as the Technical Advisory Committee recommends, would that be in any way harmful. Johnson responded that it wouldn't, it is just not the typical avenue or the way they like to see those types of projects come in, but they have no position or oversight level to stop you from submitting what you think you want to submit. Vein said that he says this with the thought that we want to be collaborative and work with the DOT, but we also want you to understand the importance of doing it, and we also don't want to have this turn into a negative, it needs to remain a positive and the idea is; what are all the avenues we have to make sure it is kept on this list because it isn't our intention to do it in the face of the DOT, but to reiterate the importance of it.

Grasser commented that, again, in line with that and recognizing the kind of unusual nature, and if you look at the dollar amounts in here, you know the City wasn't looking at an 80/20 or a 90/10 split or anything like that; they had identified it in their CIP, from a local standpoint of 50/50, so that is their attempt to entice or encourage that participation level.

Vein asked Mr. Johnson, again, as we just discussed, this doesn't neatly fit into any category, is that how you would see it too. Johnson responded that potentially, that would be kind of the intent of the decision document that they are working on; if you tell them if it will be an interchange most likely in an area where the crossroad is this, it is a local street however they have been shown a documented planning effort, a benefit that could be gained from 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, which isn't a regional roadway, but at the end of the day it all for an interchange on the Interstate System; so the intent would be to lay those things out for them and have upper management figure out how they want to do it, they may issue some sort of combination of all those issues, all the money from one pile, he doesn't know that for certain.

Grasser commented that, again, following up on that, they did the best they could with what doesn't fit into really any category and so whatever choice they made would be right and wrong; but in his mind part of that NEPA document will go back and it will evaluate alternatives with the most current information and things we have available. He added that he thinks with some of their land use planning some of those traffic patterns maybe have shifted a little bit from what that whole interstate study showed; and if in fact that NEPA document says that we can solve 32<sup>nd</sup> on 32<sup>nd</sup>, that is something we need to be aware of for consideration. He said that we are talking about the interchange now because the last document showed that that is what the solution was, but in the end we are looking for a solution and it is very time critical for us at this point.

Vein said that what he has heard so far is that we haven't been successful in getting them to do the Environmental study that we've requested, it hasn't met whatever minimum requirement importance to make the study is that accurate. Grasser responded that to his knowledge it is not; we made the request last time in the various processes and it wasn't selected in any of them, as Mr. Johnson mentioned they created that urban priority list and it didn't make that urban interchange priority list and that is why we also did kind of the unprecedented issue of putting it in in 2020. Johnson said that Mr. Grasser is right, it is currently not a funded project. Vein asked what the likelihood that in a future year we might get this. Johnson responded that he can only provide his opinion from a technical level; obviously they have to go through our management team and it would really be up to them to decide from a State perspective

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

where the funding should be allocated, and to give projects a priority order beyond the unofficial list that was identified.

Vein reiterated, though, that there wouldn't necessarily be any harm in doing it this way, it isn't maybe the normal protocol, but what he is hearing is that there may not be a typically normal protocol, and maybe the second piece to that is that we should do more than just this action, we should be taking some other individual actions specific to it too; such as the MPO maybe requesting, through a motion that we also pass the importance of this on to the DOT, and he is just speculating out loud. Johnson responded that that would be fine.

Grasser stated that Mr. Johnson did a good job of outlining the challenges and he thinks that because of all those challenges we want to make sure that we don't approach this as a City of Grand Forks request to the DOT, he thinks we really need to have the weight of the MPO behind us, which includes the Counties, the two Cities, and all of that; he thinks that has to help carry that weight so he thinks the MPO doing an additional letter would be a great idea; on top of that he would be reluctant if it was a substitute for, he would rather have it as an added to item.

Vein said that this is the Urban Regional Roads projects that we are talking about here; and this is just one item that is in the Urban Regional Roads project, so we need a motion to approve the project list that we have talked about, and that could include the Technical Advisory Committee recommendation, although it wasn't unanimous to keep this in here. Haugen responded that that is correct, he added that what he is hearing is that you want to consider the Technical Advisory Committee's recommendation.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE URBAN REGIONAL ROADS PROJECTS AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE DIRECTING MPO STAFF TO DRAFT A LETTER OF SUPPORT TO THE NDDOT TO CONSIDER APPROVING THE NEPA PROJECT APPLICATION.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

e. Urban Local Roads Projects

Haugen reported that again this is an open candidate application for the Year 2023 of the T.I.P. cycle. He said that the City of Grand Forks has submitted the rehabilitation of Columbia Road Overpass project, and that is consistent with the Street and Highway Plan you just adopted, and it is in the short-term. He added that included in the staff report was a draft report from Houston Engineering, who the City hired to give them an analysis of what is necessary and a suggestion of what priorities and what improvements should be pursued first, those are highlighted and the total cost is \$8.1 million dollars.

Haugen stated that one thing to note is that it 45% higher in cost than the cost estimate that was in the Street and Highway Plan, and that may have ramifications down the road with our fiscally constrained plans, but right now staff is recommending that it is consistent with our plan and go give it a high priority rank.

Haugen commented that you should also note, just as on the Regional Program there wasn't an official submittal of a scoping worksheet where there are traffic signal upgrades; it is our understanding that the City wants to carry that forward as an illustrative project as it is currently in our current T.I.P. and S.T.I.P.; so those are the two things that we will be taking action on, the 2023 Candidate Project and carrying on the Illustrative Project.

Grasser stated that there was a question at the Technical Advisory Committee; in the actual S.T.I.P. it says pending and apparently pending and illustrative mean the same thing, and he just wanted to clarify that. He added that his preference would have been to use the same language that shows up in the S.T.I.P. Haugen responded that the TIP is the more common language of illustrative, that is the federal language.

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE URBAN LOCAL ROADS PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE THEM PRIORITY RANKING, AND TO CONTINUE THE CITY TRAFFIC SIGNALS UPGRADE AS AN ILLUSTRATIVE PROJECT.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

Haugen commented that before we move off the North Dakota side T.I.P. he wanted to mention that we are currently open for candidate projects for the Recreational Trail Program. He stated that the applications are due to the MPO the first part of January, so next month we may have one final bit of North Dakota candidate projects to approve.

Haugen said that also in January we have the Minnesota Candidate Project Programs opening as well.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Vein stated that this maybe fits into something that he didn't quite know that we were going to do with the trails; it also maybe overlaps into the next element, which is the bike/ped, because he thinks they kind of go together.

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT**

Vein commented that they had issues with the pedestrian crossing on the Kennedy Bridge, just that cross section. He said that at one time he thought that we should have a separate pedestrian bridge over the river, somewhere between the downtown and the Kennedy Bridge; not that he is proposing that today, but that should potentially be in our planning document, but he doesn't know for sure where that location should be but he knows that we have problems with pedestrian/bicycle crossing on DeMers, and he isn't sure we have a good solution on the Kennedy, so he is wondering if this a realistic thing that people see value in of trying to get this into the planning process of where that might be, although it is years and years away he would assume, but he is in favor of at least starting the process.

Haugen responded that in the 2040 Bike/Ped Plan there is a recommendation of a separate bike/ped bridge between the Sorlie and the Kennedy; he believes that fits with the vibrancy report out of the Grand Forks Downtown and he thinks they are working on it with the Downtown Action Plan; so it has been in our past Bike/Ped plan and every five years we have approved it.

Vein asked if it is also included in the 2045 Bike/Ped Plan as well. Haugen responded that he believes it is. Vein stated, then, that he isn't asking for anything that isn't already in there. Haugen said that it is one of those things that doesn't fit into our fiscal constraint so it doesn't have any funds attached to it but it is one that we are working towards someday having happen. He added that there has also been discussion on maybe updating the Non-Motorized Bridge Study we did several years ago, that identified a potential location and how it could work, and at that time we decided to delay it; one reason was because we didn't understand how the Fargo/Moorhead Diversion Project might impact our hydraulic analysis which is important in deciding what height a bridge could be done in that area, so it is still possible that in a year or two we could update that feasibility study for that one bridge crossing.

Grasser commented that he thinks; the fact that we don't have money for it anyway, that having one in here is fine. He added, though, that in reality what we are looking for is actually two because one bridge between the Sorlie and Kennedy doesn't do either destination any good, we need a downtown destination tied to the Sorlie and a highway transportation tied to the Kennedy. He said that he is just mentioning this, he wouldn't change anything, but in his mind he doesn't think one bridge serves both of those purposes.

Vein said that he would agree with Mr. Grasser except for the fact that it will be very difficult to get one and impossible to get two. He added that where he would see one potentially placed would be even closer to University Avenue that would go across and connect to the park on the East Side, so it would be a little bit further north.

DeMers stated that there is the railroad pier there, and the reason the old bridge was removed was because the actual train platform was too low, correct. Grasser responded that the tracks and stuff were

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

causing a hydraulic impact. DeMers asked if there was a way that it could be modified and still use it as a central pier and then use that same location. Grasser responded that he thinks that was looked at, and that is where we get back to a hydraulic analysis. He added that he thinks some of that has even been included in some of the concepts. Haugen responded that it has. He explained that one of the obstacles is that a new bike/ped bridge is going to have some kind of hydraulic impact; utilizing the existing pier mitigates a lot of that new impact because it is already modeled into the system. He added that the past Historical Preservation Officer had no problem utilizing that pier for a transportation purpose because that is why it is there.

Vein said that we aren't going to design this today, but having it included, and Mr. Haugen is saying that it is already included, so he would just like to raise the awareness of it and maybe start looking at it sooner rather than later, within the next several years if possible.

Haugen said that Mr. Viafara can give a presentation if the board wishes, but we are seeking preliminary approval and you will have it again for final approval at the January meeting as well. He added that they did receive preliminary approval from the four major bodies already. Vein stated that he thinks the board should have awareness of the changes from the current plan to what is proposed in this new plan.

Haugen commented that some of the more significant changes when you compare the 2040 to the 2045 Plan would be the type of on-road facilities that are being recommended. He added that there are also some bike routes being identified in the 2045 plan where previously there may have been some sharrows and bike lanes proposed on the Grand Forks side.

Haugen stated that on the East Grand Forks side a lot of the trail along the northside of the river and around the dike system have been removed; although they are still identifying some bike lanes and some sharrows around the community so those would be the main differences between the 2040 and the 2045 proposed facilities.

***MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO GIVE PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF THE 2045 BIKE/PED ELEMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Rost.***

**MATTER OF UPDATE ON GRAND FORKS DOWNTOWN PARKING STUDY**

Haugen reported that the Downtown Parking study is moving forward. He stated that the Steering Committee has met; and one thing to note is that the study area between the 2011 study and this study is slightly different, it is smaller in this study than in the 2011 study, so we can't do an exact comparison between the two documents, but there are some trends that are consistent.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Haugen commented that the total number of parking available is roughly the same in both documents. He added that one thing to note, though, is that the usage is lower this time around than it was in 2011, so less stalls are being occupied throughout the time of day and this chart shows that comparison. He stated that the other thing they noted is that the enforcement has changed as well; there are more overtime vehicles occupying the stalls now than in 2011. He commented that as we move forward on that that is something the Steering Committee is helping us try to understand; if we have too many parking stalls, the Downtown Action Plan will be looking at some redevelopment of the parking area. He added that they are also looking at how we manage the current parking ramps as we have a lot of stalls not occupied in both ramps. He stated that they will also look at whether the current parking requirements in the code need to be modified to reflect the current parking trends and demand.

Vein said that, obviously you have data, but as they heard last Monday night at the City Council meeting, there is a proposed building coming downtown and there are others that have been identified as potential business locations. He added that he did notice that the proposed new building will offer some underground parking, but not enough to match probably the usage that will occur, and he can see that happening in other areas as well; so part of this parking study will not only look at today's needs but also what we might need tomorrow so we make sure we are developing the areas that are best developed for building spaces and not have surface parking lots. Haugen responded that they will look at that. He added that the management of the existing municipally owned parking stalls will be part of the answer to those questions.

Vein asked what the timeframe is for when we will have a preliminary draft available. Haugen responded that we will have some preliminary information available in the March timeframe. He added that this parking study is also being held concurrent with the Downtown Action Plan work that is being done as well. He explained that the Downtown Action Plan was scheduled to be done in the March timeframe but is now slipping closer to a May timeframe, so our parking study is following that same schedule.

DeMers asked what the cost of this study is. Haugen responded that it about \$60,000. DeMers asked how it handles public verses private or reserved off-street parking. Haugen referred to a map and pointed out that the dashed line shows the boundaries of the current parking assessment district, so City Code says you either provide x-parking stalls based on your specific type of land use or you can pay into this assessment district for the cost of having a stall provided by the City or a combination of that. He added that they will be looking at what those required stall ratios are, whether they are appropriate for modern land uses being built.

DeMers asked if North Dakota has the ability to have meters. Grasser responded that his recollection is that is not allowed. Haugen added that they are not allowed on public right-of-way.

**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, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

b. EGF ADA Draft

Haugen reported that the Draft ADA Plan for East Grand Forks is available for viewing on the MPO Website.

Haugen stated that we will be asking for final approval of the document in January.

c. Mn 220 North Study Update

Haugen reported that this study is underway. He said that there were meetings yesterday and there is information available for review on the MPO Website.

d. Ken Vein Comment

Vein said that he would like to say one thing as we close this meeting and that is that it has been an interesting week for him with the City of Grand Forks.

Vein stated that he appreciates the working relationship we have between our two communities and he looks forward to that continuing in a big way, and to continue to have his level of cooperation not only with the Street and Highway Plan, but with all the things we do.

e. Bill Listing For The 11/17/18 to 12/14/18 Period

Haugen reported that the list of bills for the November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2018 period was included in the packet for your review.

f. January MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting Date Change

Haugen explained that the January 2019 MPO Executive Policy Board Meeting would normally take place on January 16<sup>th</sup>, however, due to the fact that some required action by other entities will not be taken in time to address on the 16<sup>th</sup>, he is requesting moving the meeting to Wednesday, January 23<sup>rd</sup> at noon instead.

Consensus was to move the January 2019 meeting to Wednesday, January 23<sup>rd</sup> at Noon.

**ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY VETTER, TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 19<sup>TH</sup>, 2018, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:40 P.M.***

Michael Hout, Grand Forks Resident, asked if he needed to submit something to be able to speak at this meeting. Vein responded that he does not and said that he would open the floor to Mr. Hout.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Hout asked if anyone was interested in why he is here today. He said that he didn't want to interrupt the meeting, and didn't know what the protocol is for speaking, thus he didn't say anything until now.

Hout stated that he is glad that he is the only citizen here today because it has been a very interesting couple of weeks. He said that one of the things that we always talk about is communication, and everybody communicates, just not with each other and that was proven so strongly the last couple of weeks, so the question is how do we change that, how do we communicate better.

Hout commented that he heard that Mr. Sande put something into the paper that isn't very flattering to this committee, but the first thing that comes to his mind is instead of getting mad at him why wouldn't we just disprove that theory, because he did a little study himself and asked around to see if anyone was going to the MPO meeting, and they all asked what the MPO does, and he responded that they are a pretty influential committee, aren't you; just listening to the new business today, it will impact us for years and years.

Hout stated that he was at the City Council meeting this past Monday; and he apologizes for not being involved, but he called his Ward person and asked when did they start re-evaluating all these bridges, and she responded that she didn't know, so he asked people he lives by when did they start re-evaluating all these bridges and they didn't know, so he went to the meeting and there was a lot of stuff talked about, he understands the bridge issue, he has a house on both sides of the river so he knows exactly what you are talking about, and when you spoke about the kids being in danger, fine, unfortunately your heartfelt talk resonated to "well I guess let's make everybody unsafe", there was no solution in the comment, so he is trying to figure out , okay so how did we get to this.

Hout said at the end of the meeting they get to the point where we have to make a decision today or we will lose our federal funding for our roads; he doesn't know what that means, but it sounds pretty impactful, right; and he will just have to challenge you, you said well I'm not going to go to East Grand Forks and say that 32<sup>nd</sup> is off because then they won't come to the table, that kind of threw East Grand Forks under the bus, in his opinion. He stated that he still isn't totally on either side; now he is in the predicament where his house is on 32<sup>nd</sup>, he surely is he is right smack on the corner of 32<sup>nd</sup> and Belmont, so he asked where do you get this information, and they talked about the website, so he poked on the website; and here is a great question, how many people have been on this website, anybody have that number; in the real world if you have a website and you don't have that number you don't have a website. He said that he did hear something like 700 people, so he went digging on there for hours, he was intrigued by it, and he read the minutes from December of 2017 where you had a lot of questions about the bridge; good quality stuff, and god bless you guys for staying until midnight or whatever it was, but a lot of things that were discussed like the location of the bridge, the Corps of Engineers, the DOT, the Highway increase stuff if they are going to get state or federal funding that way, we have all kinds of questions, and they are great questions, but as he perused through the website there aren't any updates on any of those barriers; it was let's just pick a spot so we can start some funding, that is what he got out of it, and to think that we can put all these PDFs on a website and think that that is communicating...forget it, that ain't communicating...zero communicating, be proud of what you did and be able to face the questions people have.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

Hout referred to Mr. Haugen and stated that he called him this morning, and didn't think there was a snowball chance in heck that he was going to pick up, but he does and they talked for about an hour.

Hout said, getting back to the East Grand Forks statement that they won't come to the table for this, well he said that if we go outside the 32<sup>nd</sup> Bridge we are outside of East Grand Forks' flood protection; that's a no brainer, anybody can grasp that, so then he asked the question what does it look like once you get off the bridge, is the street wider, is there parking are there stoplights; these are things you talked about that don't cost money that can prepare people, and help six major barriers; DOT, Corps of Engineers, etc., and be able to say, this is where we are at, this is where we are at, and this is where at; and if all these checkmarks are done and handled, what is the possibility of a bridge starting construction, and funding; pretty strong right, everybody is in no-man's land, it could be six years, it could be five years, it could be another fifteen years, but it is just talk and he will challenge you, if you guys think that people know what you do, you're kidding yourselves, it is pretty obvious today; and he is glad that he is the only one here because he doesn't want to change anybody's mind, it is just him, and he has to start, he has to start talking to community and say that he went to this meeting, the bridge was one thing, but he learned about a lot of other things; that we don't talk in one or two years, we talk in fifteen, twenty, thirty year segments, and if you aren't going to get involved then you get what you get; but he thinks we need some very defined, at least projections of what this stuff is going to look like in 2045 with a bridge, where do we perceive the road coming off of there to be like, will it be a dry bridge, a wet bridge, narrow wide, trucks no trucks, weight limits. He said if that is what is best for Grand Forks then that is what is best for Grand Forks; it landlocks him, if they widen that road he isn't getting out of his driveway. He said there was even some talk in there about buy-outs; maybe you can put people at ease and say that no matter where this bridge goes no houses are going to be impeded; saying nothing is worse.

Hout stated that ultimately when it was stated at the Council meeting that there wasn't any participation from 32<sup>nd</sup>, he would challenge you with this; you had 700 people that you said participated in all of these meetings; there is a survey going on right now on line that is almost reaching 5,000 right now within a 48 hour period; how do you communicate with people, you feel comfortable with what you are doing and if you feel brave enough to go out there and talk to people, and you challenge them, because right now to say that everybody at 32<sup>nd</sup> wasn't engaged would be like a three-way tie for a sports team so we are going to flip a coin to see who plays for this championship and one team doesn't show up, is your first thought going to be that they don't care, or is it...hmmm, maybe they didn't get the message.

Hout commented that he knows he needs to change his behavior, and that means come to these meetings and listen to the stuff that you folks are talking about, it impacts both sides; but whether you like what is in the paper now, and he has no idea what it is, but he can tell you right now nobody knows what you do, no one knows what the MPO is; they don't really know what you guys suggest or what you bring to the City Council on both sides, and when there is vote you say lets run through it, you vote, and then you go back and make it work.

Hout stated that a bridge can go in at 32<sup>nd</sup>, and it can get accepted if people really know the defining purpose; it isn't 100% to help East Grand Forks, no it's not, it isn't 100% to help Grand Forks, it is to make it to where we go down to Reeves Drive, it's terrible, you see that traffic, it is just nasty; and he sees 32<sup>nd</sup> and he sees Belmont in the morning there are headlights all the way down, it has to go

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

somewhere, he is smart enough to know that and if it happens to be on his section, it is his section, but he challenges this committee; if you read the paper and you get mad, don't get mad at him, ask yourself internally how do I disapprove him, how do I make him look like an idiot, that's the only way you win.

Vetter commented that Mr. Hout and himself also visited on the phone yesterday for quite a while. He explained that he has been involved with the City Council for long time and he can tell you that until there is a problem that comes up that involves any citizen they aren't going to engaged until late, and they all know what we need and they all can listen on our broadcast now, but you can have ward meetings and you will get the same people at the ward meetings every time, and unless there is a problem that affects one particular individual, they aren't going to go to them. Hout said that he absolutely 100% agrees, but he is also telling you this, when you talk about something, and you talk about both sides of the river, and it as impactive as this there is a way to get people to get energized; number one, whether it is via your website or the Grand Forks Herald or something else, all you have to do is go into your PDF's where you have the line drawn for the bridges and say that the MPO and the Cities are voting and talking about this picture and you would have more people showing up at that meeting. He added that no one is going to decry a downtown bridge for said bikepath, which he thinks is just an awesome deal, but that isn't going to stir up a lot of stuff and no one is really going to say much.

Vetter responded that we have done that; we've sent out notices in the Herald, we've sent out e-mails, we've posted it on our website. Hout stated that he doesn't know where you've sent them because he has been in Grand Forks now for twenty-some odd years, he has lived on Belmont for going on 13 years, and this is news to him. He added that he isn't a Herald reader, he does read the stuff in the mail, and he is a social media type of person so if there was something that came across talking about the 32<sup>nd</sup> Bridge proposal, or if it said "Newsflash – all bridge re-evaluation done, meeting tonight", he sure would have been there. Vetter stated that Dana Sande knew about it, he has been a City Councilperson for some time so he knew about it; and although he didn't go to the Grand Forks Council meeting, but if he said he didn't know anything about it, he is lying. Hout responded that he doesn't know if he said that but he knows that his Ward person, Sandy Marshall; when he called her said that she had no idea that they were looking at the bridge. Vetter responded that Ms. Marshall held a Ward meeting and he attended it and no one from 32<sup>nd</sup> showed up but a bunch of people from 47<sup>th</sup> showed up. Hout asked, then, what does that tell you; do you think that they were that disinterested. Vein responded that he actually maybe does believe that, because why would people from 47<sup>th</sup> come and no one from 32<sup>nd</sup>.

Vein commented that we have a dilemma, and there is no question about it and Mr. Hout makes some very valid points, but as Mr. Vetter said; unless something is imminent, people don't show up and we try and try, and everybody is so busy these days it seems that we just don't have time to be that far ahead of things. He said that the MPO held a meeting with both City Councils, both County Commissions, and both Planning Commissions at the Townhouse this summer, along with others, the media was there, it was reported and we talked about bridges; in fact we expanded the study to make sure that we included all the areas and it was very clearly communicated that we were talking about bridges and to this date he has only gotten two feedback submittals, even since Monday, feedback on bridges and they were from the people closest to Minnesota and 4<sup>th</sup> because they feel that a southend bridge will help solve some of

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

their traffic issues. He said that they weren't at the meeting, although they have been at previous meetings, and in this very room the President's of both City Councils sat and had a discussion and they both agreed to look at the need for a southend bridge, and that was supposed to be the solution to part of the safety concerns we have in other areas, and yet one of those got up and talked against the southend bridge and put the article in the paper, so it is frustrating for us too, what do we do, and he is more than willing to listen to other options and try to be better.

Hout stated that this it's the same thing; how do you deal with millennials, how do you communicate with them, who's got the answer, are we going to stop looking; so what he is saying is, your point is well taken, nobody is energized, but you only had two people call you, matter of deduction says – well this is an impactful thing so I have to get this out, I have to ensure that this gets out. He said that if you put a variable message sign on DeMers and you put a picture of the bridges on there and you said meeting tonight at the Townhouse, people would show up, it's a visual thing that they are going to see.

Hout commented that when he went on the website and looked at all the data, he went..Wow, I hope somebody read this from front to back, but it made sense to him, he could see bridge, no bridge, it makes sense; and the more conversation he has, he had a phone call with Mr. Haugen, he left the phone call feeling better, but he also got off the call saying why in the heck am I just talking about this now; and he is going to plead ignorance, but he isn't now after he went on the website and he wanted to see when this body meets, he wanted to see it on the calendar and he put it on his calendar and anything that involves zoning and stuff he checked it with the 32<sup>nd</sup> stop light stuff; that's not going to happen, we are kind of green right there, but that is down the road, but when someone talks to him the last thing he is going to say is well it's that MPO Board, he is going to say – Well how involved are you, did you go to the meetings. He added that the reason he sat at the Council meeting that whole night is because he felt it was very improper for everybody to get up and make all that noise when you were trying to conduct your business, and he felt that that didn't look very good for the 32<sup>nd</sup> crew, so he has to change his ways, he isn't pointing fingers, he is just saying that if you think that people know what the MPO is, spend a thousand bucks of each sides' money, hire a college student to call random numbers and ask if them if the MPO is a football team, is it a governing body, do they make decisions for both or each side and see what they say, there's your answer; don't assume that you're communicating because you're not.

DeMers stated that he agrees with Mr. Hout; he spent a better part of his career on the council thinking about those issues, how do you deal with transparency and communication and outreach, and he really struggles with it because you can see really good websites for big cities who have done some really incredible things and just by sheer numbers you get some interesting data; that is the hopeful side of him but the cynical side of him says it won't work. He explained that when he was a Ward representative he used to, out of his own pocket, send out postcards to every person in the Ward to let them know that he was going to be holding a Ward meeting a couple times a year and he would get a couple of people to show up, so that is the cynical side that says that unless there is something, like Mr. Vetter said, unless something is burning, and you get that ground swell, that grass root group, because that started on Facebook, it was a couple of people on Facebook that started that spin-off, and that had nothing to do with anybody, and you can't generate that really well from this spot, it is tough, but he shouldn't say that, you should always be looking and always be trying to communicate. He stated that his point is that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

part of the benefit of representative government, and this body, is that we are supposed to take those concerns to this board for you; and he would say that if you look through those minutes you would see that all of those concerns that came before the Grand Forks Council have been discussed over and over and over again; not anything that was said there was new, and we knew that that was the kind of reaction we would get, so while the individual people didn't get to express those opinions or concerns, they were expressed and they continue to be and he thinks the best we can do is to hope that you elect good representatives that will bring those concerns forward for you, and like he said he wants to build good communication avenues, but the MPO by its nature is, when we bring things to the council there are members that are almost sleeping, and it is an acronym laden in the weeds federal top down kind of thing and not many people can appreciate it. Hout said that what would wake them up is phone calls so that they can hear what is going on before problems occur.

Hout commented that when you say you want to communicate, there is a way to communicate, it is the same when you want to get a measure through; there is extra activity that happens if you want to get a measure through, you just figure out a way, how am I going to wake these people up that are going to be influenced, you have to figure out a way, and there is a way, it is like communicating with your kids, you have to figure out how to do it. He added that it doesn't take any onus off of him, he has to be 100% involved; to your point he should have been involved all those weeks 100%; is he going to be narrowed in on this, absolutely, and is he going to champion you guys, absolutely; if someone calls up and says what they heck are they doing now he'll tell them to come with him, they can ride with him, he is going over to East Grand Forks to go to an MPO meeting and you can listen to it, but these letters do nothing, and whatever Mr. Sande put in the paper means nothing to him because he doesn't know where that comes from and he should have addressed that a long time ago, right; you guys weren't just invented. Vein responded that a bit of that is our frustration because Mr. Sande was at these meetings, and he knew all about these bridges and the issues and supported the study, and now, he hasn't read what is in there, so all he can say is that is what he did in the past.

Grasser said that he thinks, we finished off this process but we are going to be starting another one, right, we will begin working on the next five year cycle pretty quickly; he thinks part of our challenge will be to try to figure out a different way to engage the public, we've been using the same old moves pretty much every time and getting a lot of the same results. He stated that he doesn't know what the answer is today, but we need to think about how to change or improve our engagement methods because it isn't rocket science, really, you can look at the items and things that are coming up and you can see what will trigger people's hot buttons; such as taking parking off the street, rerouting a major roadway, and a bridge kind of fits into that component, but he doesn't know that we have to try to capture everything that is in the Long Range Transportation Plan, but we can probably do a better job. He added that timing is a big part of it; we probably shouldn't, again we get to the end and then we've got this anvil hanging over our heads if we don't approve it, so he thinks that there are things that we can think about to improve things the next go-around.

Hout commented that he thinks if 32<sup>nd</sup> is for a bridge it's a bridge but you have to have a visual for what both ends look like because if there are issues now is the time to talk about it if you are looking at a three, four, five, six year timeframe; so if people want to leave there they can leave there if they want to

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2018**

stay there they can stay there, but giving it to them even two years prior to that and how long this stuff takes, not long enough. He stated that even if it doesn't come to fruition, this is what the back end looks like and this is what the back end looks like so they can kind of generalize. He said that it isn't going to be any worse than by the Sorlie Bridge now, right; it is just going to be an extension of 32<sup>nd</sup>, it isn't going to be any worse but the perception of the unknown riles up people; you can never over-communicate that stuff even if it doesn't happen.

Hout thanked the Board for allowing this discussion and stated that he is glad that he is the only person here; he is not trying to sway anybody's thoughts on this whatsoever, but he knows that he has been in this world long enough to know that if you think you're communicating, but people say you aren't communicating, you not communicating; it is that simple and there isn't a magic bullet, but there is a bullet out there if you look, especially for something this impactful.

DeMers commented that one thing he was thinking about; someone was relaying a message from someone in that area that we aren't listening to them, they aren't giving information to us; and it reminded him of something that someone told him when he was running a political campaign, and he was saying the same thing, that people weren't listening to the rational, they aren't listening to me, and the person said, they are listening, they just don't like what they are hearing, and there is some of that to this issue as well, and he would bet that if you dug deeper you would find that some of the people in that area are aware that 32<sup>nd</sup> has been the preferred spot for a bridge for a long time; but he still agrees that it is something that we do need to improve on, but it is a two-way street to some degree.

Powers explained that this board is made up of two City Council members from each side, one Planning and Zoning Commission member from each side, and one County Planning Commission member from each side, so it is a well rounded group, and most of us have been involved for a very long time. Vein commented that that may be part of our problem to be honest; you get store blind because we've been there and done that and we've had this discussion and it is just a repeat of what happened before, but there gets to be new people and to be honest people maybe forget. He said that he knew a lot of those people on 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, they have been there for a long time, so he was really surprised to see that this would be considered to be something new to the people he knows over there, but he isn't going to say they are lying, maybe they forgot. Hout commented that he doesn't think a lot of people knew the bridges were being re-studied, and he doesn't believe that anyone thought 32<sup>nd</sup> was on the table. He said that he thinks they just thought that there really wasn't any discussion, that is where their heads are at.

Vein thanked Mr. Hout for coming and added that he actually appreciates when people actually sit and listen, and he apologizes for not asking you for your input earlier, but at lot of times if people will come and sit and listen, that is great and we appreciate it.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis, Office Manager