

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

**Wednesday, April 17th, 2019 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the April 17th, 2019, 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: Clarence Vetter, Mike Powers, Warren Strandell, Al Grasser, Marc DeMers, Bob Rost, and Ken Vein (via conference call).

Absent was: Jeannie Mock

Guest(s) were: Jane Williams, 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 MARCH 20TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE MARCH 20TH, 2019 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2020-2023 T.I.P.

Haugen reported that at this time of year we would normally be asking you to consider a draft of both the Grand Forks and the Polk County side T.I.P.s but this year the NDDOT is not quite prepared with their programming of projects yet. He said that we are on schedule on the Minnesota side so before you is a Draft T.I.P. for the Minnesota side only and we are hoping that in May we will have the North Dakota side Draft T.I.P. for consideration as well.

Haugen commented that we did schedule a public hearing for our Technical Advisory Committee meeting last Wednesday and there was no one present for discussion, nor were any written comments submitted either.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

Haugen stated that at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting there were a couple of minor adjustments made to some program numbers that MnDOT uses to identify projects and those adjustments have been made.

Haugen explained that for the most part the T.I.P. reflects the current three years of our current T.I.P. He commented that the fourth year is really just projects that are transit oriented in East Grand Forks, so the new year of the T.I.P. does not reflect any other transportation improvements. He added that the 3 years, between 2020 and 2022 are consistent with the current T.I.P. documents, although there are a couple of minor dollar revisions.

Haugen stated that both Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of the Draft Minnesota Side 2020-2023 T.I.P., as presented.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY GRASSER, TO APPROVE THE DRAFT MINNESOTA SIDE 2020-2023 T.I.P.

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

Voting Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mock

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY RFP

Haugen reported that this is a study that we have in our work program to start this year and finish next year. He added that we do have in our work program a consult budget of \$120,000 for this project and we have been working with the Technical Advisory Committee and local agencies on preparing the draft scope of work; and assuming approval today, the next step for us to get this submitted to the NDDOT Qualification Based Selection Process. He explained that that normally takes several days from the action today to the actual posting on their website, and that is the official announcement of the RFP.

Haugen commented that we have a timeline of May 29th to get the submittal back, so there is a fairly quick turnaround, although it isn't the minimum amount of days, but it isn't too much above that. He added that this will get us into a June approval of the selected consultant, and allow us to really start in earnest on the project at the end of June or first part of July.

Haugen reported that for the background and scope of work we are working from the existing documents and the Downtown Action Plan, which the City of Grand Forks has been working on for about a year now. He added that we are also working from the DeMers Avenue Reconstruction Project Traffic Operations Report that identified future capacity concerns that won't be addressed with the project itself, maintaining the three lanes.

Haugen commented that we are also working from the Minnesota Mobility Plan to identify DeMers in East Grand Forks as having one of the few segments in Greater Minnesota with mobility issues; that we

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

would like to have a plan of attack on how to address them. He said that connected to that is a program that MnDOT has to replace traffic signals on the Minnesota side of the Downtown so there is an opportunity for better signal coordination between the two downtowns; that is what we are hoping the study will identify.

Haugen stated that the last piece will be the Parking Study; working with some of the developments that have been identified through the Downtown Action Plan, which has looked at some of the management of vehicles in the downtown, some scenarios of what future development might be impacting that demand, so with those we are working on a study of how to meet the future transportation needs that are being forecasted between the two downtowns and study alternatives to address those needs and come up with a recommendation and plan of action for that.

Haugen said that concerning the Steering Committee, the one thing that he failed to insert here, but that we talked about at the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, is that all of our standard Steering Committees; NDDOT Central Office and the North Dakota Federal Highway as the Lead Federal Agency requested to be identified as members of all Steering Committees, he failed to put that in so that would be an addition to the RFP that we have for consideration.

Haugen commented that the study area is generally coming off the DeMers Overpass Bridge through both downtowns up to and ending at Gateway Drive, and a block or two on either side of DeMers Avenue.

DeMers asked if the multi-modal portion of this would that include a study analysis of additional pedestrian crossings. Haugen responded that it would. DeMers asked if that is specifically addressed or is it something that we could look at. Haugen responded that it is both; it is specifically addressed through the identification of issues, public feedback, and this bodies influence on it, specific areas would be focused in on.

Vein said that he is assuming that you will look at all vehicular traffic including truck traffic, such as during the beet harvest; pedestrian traffic; bicycle traffic; etc, and would you also look at any need for a pedestrian bridge or bicycle over the river, maybe adjacent to DeMers Avenue also. Haugen responded that they will be using some of the previous studies that had identified that, but to what extent we will do it on this study is not in any greater depth than that. He added that with some of the work that was done on the Sorlie Bridge EIS process, that ended up with just a repainting, there was some analysis of the sidewalk cantilevered off that exists today, and the ability to accommodate expansion. He said that there have been previous studies that have looked at the existing river pier from the old bridge and how that could be used, so to that level that is all that would be anticipated.

Vein stated that he would like; he thinks that is a good start, and we can see how that all might come together, but with the reconstruction of DeMers Avenue downtown for Grand Forks and with the North 3rd Street now being planned, and the question of the bump outs being established, ulterior bicycle traffic may increase downtown so he thinks the connectivity between Grand Forks and East Grand Forks should be looked at, all of that in its entirety and possibly starting with the existing studies, but also what might be needed, so we need to make sure that all of that is included.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

Grasser referred back to the Steering Committee list and asked who the DDA is. Haugen responded that that has not been identified. Grasser asked if that would be a member of the Economic Development Group. Haugen responded that it would be a member from the Downtown Action Plan. Grasser stated that a member from the Economic Development Group would have been on that committee, and he added that he is trying to figure out, as this whole thing was somewhat initiated by our Economic Development Group, if we shouldn't have a member from the Economic Development Group be on the Steering Committee in some manner, and if they were already encompassed in one of the other groups then it is a non-issue, but if not they maybe should be. Haugen responded that the Economic Development Group has someone that serves on the Downtown Action Committee so they could be the one that continues on in that role, but if you want to make sure that it is specific to the Economic Development Group then we could add them. Grasser responded that he wouldn't mind adding them at least as an option, if they aren't interested we wouldn't require them to be there but he thinks they should have the opportunity.

MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY RFP SUBJECT TO INCLUSION OF A MEMBER FROM THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GROUP ON THE STEERING COMMITTEE.

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

Voting Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mock

MATTER OF JOINT CITY COUNCIL BRIDGE MEETING

Haugen reported that this item was included to allow the MPO Executive Policy Board to have a discussion on what transpired at the Joint City Council Bridge Meeting last Wednesday night. He stated that included in the packet is a copy of the presentation that was presented to those present at the meeting.

Vein stated that he thought that Mr. Haugen did a very good job presenting at the combined meeting of the City Councils. He said that it turned into a lot of public input; as there was standing room only.

Vein said that a lot of comments were made on the 32nd Avenue South Bridge potential, both for and against it. He added that he thought the MPO should be aware of this so he talked to Mr. Haugen and asked that it be placed on today's agenda. He stated that one of the things he thought would be beneficial would be to go back and look at the video of the meeting and kind of surmise and put together a listing of all the questions and/or maybe direct comments that were made about options; that we take those comments and work with staff, and with potentially our traffic consultants, try to make sure that we answer those because he thinks that if we don't they are just going to linger and keep coming back as options or reasons to support or not support what we are doing, so he knows that the plan is adopted by both communities that are wondering if we could at least carry this one step further knowing that we had all those individuals there asking more questions.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

Vetter commented that he did speak with one of the community members that was there and he had some concerns; he said that there were some conflicts with the speeds on the roads and how our study showed that there wasn't a speed problem on the roads, and then there speed boxes that were just on light poles that said the speed is thirty miles per hour, but when it was rechecked it said the speeds were a lot higher, so he was concerned about the data, and if it any of that makes sense. Haugen responded that we did a Near Southside Neighborhood study and through several years of evolution the neighbors there have been sharing concerns about speeds so the Police Department brought their speed trailer, which you are probably familiar with as it has the Police Logo on it and it operates in either display mode or stealth mode, and they took speed studies using both methods and those studies showed that the 85th percentile was virtually the same as the posted speed limit of 25 in those neighborhoods. He said that the neighborhood wasn't overly confident in that result, so we got involved and this body approved we use A.T.A.C., so we used their radar speed detectors, which were more obscure and put on poles and captured speeds that showed that those speeds were more in the 30 mph 85th percentile.

Haugen commented that on Reeves itself we did some pilot traffic calming techniques; we studied the speed effect during the temporary installation then again after installation, and we had similar speed results that indicated that the traffic calming that is on Reeves now didn't really slow down the traffic. He added that the City has purchased those radar speed detectors that were first used, and they redid the study and they got similar results as well.

Vetter asked if any of the data that was collected was used in the bridge analysis. Haugen responded that it was not, they were two separate studies. He explained that speed in the bridge analysis is generated from the posted speed limits on the signs and what the capacity of the roadway allows people to travel down the road so as our roadway gets more constricted the speed gets lowered as a result. Vetter said, then, that for future this individual was complaining that because those two speed studies were conflicting he was starting to question the data in the rest of the bridge study; that if there is conflict there there is probably conflict with some of the other data, so he wasn't putting a lot of weight into our Bridge study then because he thought the data was flawed. Haugen commented that in his opinion there isn't much correlation between the two studies.

DeMers commented that, just a note; one of the most common ruse of the cynic is to find one discrepancy and extrapolate that from the data set out there, and then he gets the idea that if there is a flaw somewhere, there are potential flaws elsewhere, so even if that usually isn't case; you can find one small inaccuracy, or one small conflict but it doesn't always extrapolate out, so he agrees that we should be very diligent in looking for those types of things, but not only does it not correlate, it doesn't extrapolate to the entire data set.

DeMers asked if maybe a review of what happened Monday at the City Council meeting in Grand Forks or what vote was take, what the action was, and what do you see as the potential outcome from that so that the MPO can potentially react. Vein responded that Howard Swanson, City Attorney, is reviewing a previous MPO action that had numbering errors, and how the numbering that we used was going to fit into the City Code, and he stated that we should correct the numbering; and they had made that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

recommendation at the City Council just to confer with it; it had nothing to do with the actual merits of the report, but was just trying to correct the numbering. He said that Ms. Mock was not present, so there were six of the seven members there and it turned out that three were in favor of making what would be more of a correction, and three opposed it so it went to a vote and the Mayor had to break the tie and he spoke against making the corrections, so it died and it didn't make changes - it is just that the numbering won't match what should have been in the final product. He added that basically those that voted against, his perception is that they didn't want to see a 32nd Avenue South Bridge so they didn't want to make this correction, and the rest of them were just looking to try to make the correction as recommended by the City Attorney.

DeMers said that he was getting some reports that this was some sort of re-vote of the MPO; but even at some point this is proxy for that; but he doesn't want to make anyone speculate on other people's voting, he is just trying to capture what went on at the meeting.

Grasser commented that what they had before them was a technical correction, a purely technical issue that didn't have anything really to do with the bridge or the Long Range Transportation Plan; but some of the discussion went towards the 32nd Avenue South Bridge, which to a degree wasn't germane to the issue at hand. The discussion did migrate along that same line even though they weren't voting on a bridge issue they were trying to send a message with some of the verbiage that was tossed out.

DeMers stated that he was just wondering because it came kind of directly on the heels of the intercity meeting. Grasser said that he thinks that it was an overlap, but from a pure technical standpoint the issue before them had nothing to do with the bridge.

Strandell reported that he spent some time with the Minnesota District Engineer talking about bridge sites and such; and in the process gave him some of the materials we've gotten over the years, and the study that was done that came out with a cost/benefit ratio on the 47th Avenue and he was really concerned about what the factor was that made that not work from a cost/benefit standpoint. Haugen responded that it is because of the fact that it attracts too much traffic extra miles of travel, and so there is not a decrease in miles traveled, nor a decrease in hours traveled. He said that 47th Avenue actually has an increase of those so it is a negative benefit, and so the cost analysis shows you are adding more miles, which is not a benefit, it is a cost; and you are adding more hours, which is not a benefit, it is a cost; so that is why the benefit /cost is not favorable, it attracts too much traffic from the north side of both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks and causes more miles and more hours that are traveled and those are the two main drivers in a benefit/cost analysis.

Grasser commented that one thing that we need to be careful of with that, though, is that we should be trying to probably speculate out the next 50 or 60 or 75 years as opposed to the 20-year plan. He stated that he thinks with the 20 year plan, neither City had probably grown as far south, so you have more travel but if the communities for both, looking at where things would be in 50 years he wonders if that analysis traveled distance would be the same. Haugen commented that he thinks that Grand Forks has a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

flood protection that is still a mile away from where the existing growth is and their 2045 plan shows them not going within a half mile of the flood protection system. He added that 32nd is the flood protection boundary on the East Grand Forks side. DeMers stated that he gets that idea, and he thinks that when the City started if we would have put a bridge at 24th it would have made a lot of sense now, but it would have been a bridge to nowhere then, and we all know that there would have been not only the problem with that but the political cost would have been terrible and frankly funding sources aren't going to fund bridges to nowhere; so it is a tough situation, you have to build something that is usable but then when you do that it is going to interrupt peoples lives. He added that as we look out 50 years, he doesn't think we have to just project the traffic in 50 years, but what are the safety ramifications in 50 years, we learned a lot from stakeholders at the schools about how we are going to be running traffic right by a 1000 kids, right, and then they dismissed the downtown kids by saying there are only about 200, but they lack the insight that there is an evolution that probably 25 or 30 years ago those downtown schools had much higher population and as we moved forward and look at 55th for a possible new school, or where ever they keep growing, those population shifts will follow that and those schools on 32nd will decrease in population as well as it stretches further out; so the traffic volume might go further south, potentially, depending on how fast East Grand Forks will grow.

DeMers commented that there is also the safety factor issue, and he thinks some of it is more emotional than it is real; but he thinks we could spend some money on mitigation factors and alleviate that. He stated that as we grow the population changes are going to affect which corridors have safety factors, so absolutely we should be looking 50 years out, but we also don't want to build bridges to nowhere; and as a result of that meeting that is kind of what happened, the only thing that anybody could agree on is that we need something on Merrifield, where nobody lives, and he thinks the Counties should be working on that, but from the City's perspective it just doesn't handle what we are trying to do, as he said, we don't want to build something in the middle of nowhere; the farmers and the truck traffic do, and he thinks that would be great, if we could get that done it would be great, but we are at a point now that if we build it anywhere in that corridor between 47th and 24th you are going to have people upset, but if you look at the bridge location options he thinks 24th makes the most sense from a geography and geometry perspective, but 24th isn't equipped to handle the traffic in the same way 32nd is.

DeMers reiterated that it was an interesting meeting, and the one thing he told Mr. Vein that he is proud of, that this committee has done and this staff has done is, every single one of the issues that were brought up, we went through, and we keep hearing that people haven't been heard, or that people's voices aren't being heard and we don't understand; but everybody knows that there are schools, everybody knows that and one of the things he appreciates is that we have taken a more data driven approach and we've tried to take the emotion out of it to make at least a plan and now it is up to the policy and political folks to lead to try to implement that plan, and we haven't seen that, but the best that we can do is create a plan that is the most efficient, the safest, and the least expensive option possible; and following those three guidelines he thinks we have come up with that, so it is really a political leadership issue from here on out.

Vein stated that he thinks Mr. DeMers made a lot of good points; and he did actually go back to the archives at the Grand Forks Herald and he believes he identified seven different articles that had been

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

published in the Herald that did identify the fact that we are looking at south end bridges, and he was part of at least three public meetings, and Mr. Haugen and his staff had many more meetings than that, he knows there were in the neighborhood of six or seven hundred comments on it, so he thinks we did a great job and did our diligence, but it is still surprising how many people still don't feel informed with all of that publicity.

Vein said that one question he has is in regard to the presentation; specifically the slide that said "shovel ready project", and to do that it isn't just the construction, you talked about permit/approval, right-of-way and/or easements, and permits; how long of a process does it take to get a project shovel ready, best case scenario. Haugen responded that to meet this definition the generic process would be to get it identified in a plan, then to put it into the four year T.I.P., and normally the first three years of a T.I.P. are already set, so the fourth or fifth year would be the first time it could be programmed dollars. He explained that typically you have the program in place, and then you go through the project development, which includes the NEPA and the rest of the process, so that takes it probably five years out. He stated that there are examples where projects aren't in a fiscally constrained plan, nor in a fiscally constrained T.I.P., but the project development has gone quite a ways down the road, so to speak; but they have not received the official permits or the official record of decision.

Grasser commented that this kind of where they are at with the 42nd Street Underpass Project, where they have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on that one getting through the environmental clearance, and then we ended up with a catch-twenty-two in that we can't move it forward because it isn't in the S.T.I.P. or the T.I.P. because we can't meet financial constraints, and so we can't get clearance to get it in there, and he thinks that was one of the questions that did come up with the State. He added that he thinks it has been pretty straight forward, at least Mr. Noehre has, that a bridge on 32nd that isn't on a State Highway would mean that they would have to dedicate urban monies, or sales tax monies or Prairie Dog monies to meet the financial constraint, and if you don't get it into the program than the environmental process gets stale after something like three years or so and you start to lose the investment you made to get it to that point, it is a touch situation to be in, to meet that shovel ready definition.

Strandell reported that when they did the Thompson Bridge, that was a shovel ready project. He explained the process they went through and how everything, other than the bridge itself, was in place and ready to go and then they got the money to design the bridge and they were able to build it for less than \$7 million dollars, and now we are talking four times that much for another bridge. Haugen stated that when they use the definition "shovel ready" they aren't using the federal definition, they are using more of a definition of what the City of Grand Forks is doing with the 42nd Street Grade Separation; you are carrying it as far as you can go, but until you have the money in hand you are not going to get the federal sign-off which is the key to the federal definition.

Haugen commented that he recalls two alternatives that we haven't really examined in great detail that were brought up; the 62nd Avenue location option and the other was the option of just bringing the bridge over into the Greenway and have multiple corridors with openings for traffic to decide which corridor it wants to go down instead of just penetrating the dike at one location, somehow getting traffic through the flood protection system at multiple locations.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

DeMers stated that from a common sense perspective it seems like the 62nd model would be similar or worse than the 47th for that type of bridge unless you are trying to merge the two bridges into one, maybe that would be an option, but he still doesn't think you are going to see what you want to see; but he doesn't have a problem studying it in the next go-around. He added that on the "magic disbursement plan" he fails to see how putting something like that in, with all the costs for infrastructure that would be involved would be somehow cheaper or more effective than spending a certain amount of money on pedestrian safety on the 32nd corridor. He said that he bets if we spent a million dollars on pedestrian safety on the 32nd corridor from Belmont to Washington it would be money well spent instead of trying to figure out some crazy bridge-plus punching four holes in the dikes, it is a solution in search of a problem.

Grasser commented that the other question is, if we do a high level bridge, which is one of the things that came out; he is envisioning a lot of those locations would probably go up and over the levee as opposed to punching a hole, and that's why it's an important decision if we are going high level or low level because it would change a lot of dynamics. He said that a high level bridge would make the hydraulic impacts less; and he still worries about that until we do a hydraulic analysis, the Corps of Engineers, can we get a permit for or would there be too much of a hydraulic impact; but there is a lot of dollars.

Grasser said that another thing that occurred to him when they were at the meeting is if you look at the bridge cross section that we've been doing; he doesn't know if that it has really mattered much up to now because we have just been doing comparative, one to the other, but the dimensions on this one, he thinks, if we characterize that is geometry having physical limitations for trucks, he doesn't know if he would be comfortable representing that when he looks at the cross section that we have there; twelve foot lanes and eight foot shoulders, you've got a 40-foot wide opening there so he thinks you would have a hard time convincing people that trucks couldn't drive that, so would there be a cost savings if we were shrink that, but at this point he doesn't know that it matters as long as we are comparing most of the same one to the other at different locations, but public discussion is kind of leaping to almost that next phase so you may want to look at that to clarify that that is the right cross section to have for an intercity bridge.

Strandell asked if there were any other possibilities than 47th and 32nd and 24th, are there any other possibilities. Grasser responded that he would have to look, but none come to mind. He added that at least on the section lines you've got some of your better, more through roads; again, having said that, 24th has a bunch of driveways, 32nd has a bunch of driveways, so they really weren't preserved as a corridor to that level, and so any other streets in-between would have some of those same challenges, not to say that we can't take a peek at it, but nothing jumps out. Strandell commented that it doesn't appear that anything is going to survive the review by people. Grasser agreed that that will be a challenge.

Vetter stated that this is good discussion, and we need to keep moving forward on it. He added that hopefully a pot of money comes up and we can at least start doing some environmental studies and keep moving it forward.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

MATTER OF RECENT PEDESTRIAN FATALITIES

Haugen reported that this is an agenda item that Mr. Vein asked be put on the agenda. He explained that there were a couple of recent fatalities on the Grand Forks side, both at the interchange area at I-29, one at Gateway and one at DeMers. He commented that the information we have is really from the newspaper article.

Haugen stated that we do have, as identified in the staff report, a target for safety; and in regard to pedestrian it is combined with fatalities and serious injuries, and up until 2007 to 2017 there were no bike or ped related fatalities, in 2018 we had one fatality in Grand Forks on 20th and 32nd Avenue, and now so far in 2019 we have had these two pedestrian deaths.

Vein commented that he asked that this get put on because obviously pedestrian safety is extremely important for everybody, whether its 32nd Avenue South or DeMers Avenue or Minnesota/4th; and we have some targets that we want to meet to ensure pedestrian safety. He stated that he doesn't know all the details around any one of these, but he just wondered if there was something that should be at least studied a little further to see if there are ways that we could make either of these locations safer, that is what his thought was.

Haugen stated that on the DeMers location the City just successfully put in a side path on the southside of the roadway. He explained that at the time of night that the person was walking the corridor it may not have been evident since they are starting further west where there is no side path to that 48th Street existing side path, so we just don't know why. He said that Jane Williams, Traffic Engineer is here, and when he talked to her on Friday she also had little information and investigations are still on-going.

Williams commented that any fatality that occurs NDDOT has a specific team that goes out and investigates the site to see if there are any deficiencies or anything like that and five of the six fatalities that we have had within the last 18 months have occurred on State Highways. She stated that she doesn't know exactly where the DeMers fatality occurred, if it was anywhere to the east of the westerly ramp then it would be on the State Highway, if it happened between Amtrak and the westerly ramp it would be a City street so she is waiting to see exactly where it happened, but NDDOT does do an investigation into them. Vein said that that is good to hear, so he guesses we will just have to wait, and he is anxious to hear what those results are and if there is something else we can be planning for, or budgeting for, that might be our next steps. He asked if they had any idea when those reports might be ready. Williams said that she would check into it and let him know.

DeMers asked if we have any indication what the rates of speed were. Rost responded that they would have done an accident recreation on it and would have been able to determine the speed of the striking vehicle, and that would be part of the investigation. He added that they would also look at the debris that was left behind to determine make and model of the striking vehicle as well.

DeMers commented that our targets are based on five year rolling averages; so what happens if we go above our target, is there some sort of an action plan that we have to put into place, or are there any

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

penalties. Haugen responded that for the MPO there isn't a penalty from a federal perspective; from a statewide perspective there is the potential that the funding flexibility is lost. He explained how the funding/target process works. He added that at the MPO level there is no penalty from the feds forcing us to spend 100% of our safety dollars, but it is an onus on us from a planning and programming to see why our targets are being exceeded and determining what we can do to bring them down to the level we would like.

Powers asked if there was a dedicated sidewalk at the 4300 block of Gateway. Williams responded that the traffic signals at the ramp, 43rd does not have a traffic signal to go across Gateway. Powers asked if it had a sidewalk. Williams responded that there is not a ramp or crosswalk at that area. Haugen stated that on the southside there is a side path. Powers stated that he is confused, if there was a sidewalk and the pedestrian was on the sidewalk how did he get hit. Williams responded that they were traveling north and south bound, the pedestrian was traveling south bound. Grasser suggested that he may have been coming from McDonalds or the gas station there.

Haugen commented that there is a recommendation of improving the pedestrian access crossing as part of the U.S. #2 Study that was done a couple years ago, so there are identified improvements. Grasser asked if this wasn't one of the locations we were looking at a need for a grade separation. Haugen responded that that was part of the Glasston Study that we did for potential State Mill unit trains coming up the Glasston Sub, and that was kind of the trigger of a grade separation here, but those unit trains are now using the Mill Spur, but they do still have the ability at a future time to connect back to Glasston, but right now they are going up the Mill Spur, so the grade separation lost a lot of luster

MATTER OF UPDATE ON STUDY OPEN HOUSES

Mn220No Corridor Study

Viafara commented that they held the fourth Steering Committee meeting yesterday here in the training room; and then they also held an open house later in the afternoon. He said that both meetings were, in their opinion, very well attended.

Viafara reported that the purpose of the meetings to discuss the recommended improvements that are being indicated by the consultant and also supported by members of the Steering Committee as possible alternatives to address access control, mobility, safety and pedestrian crossings on the corridor. He said that all of those alternatives were identified in order to improve the concerns that we have at this particular intersection.

Viafara stated that two intersections were deserving more attention, and because of the alternatives that were proposed for those intersections. He said that one was the 23rd Street and the other was the 17th Street intersections with Mn 220No.

Viafara reported that on 23rd Street there is a proposed round-about; and this has been identified by members of the Steering Committee as one of the highest ranked alternatives. He said that it is a

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

feasible alternative, in terms of long term, the design allows for some kind of intersection control and despite concerns brought to our attention by neighboring residents, and also by members of the community, it was the impression that, based on the designs that were presented at the discussion, in terms of information provided; the round-about as a solution continues enjoying a certain level of support, a high level of support by this membership.

Viafara said that a good many very important consideration given that agriculture is a part of the economic base of the region, many agricultural farms enjoy access to the premises through the use of the northeastern part of the premise so it was the impression, it was our understanding that those in attendance, members of a particular community were at least supportive of the things all the improvements that were proposed. He added that the same happens to the round-about proposed for 17th Street. He said that this round-about is still conveniently feasible and would be supported by a number of intersection controls, and again agricultural equipment, given the weight and width of the equipment were discussed and yet they could be accommodated within the design.

Haugen asked if he could give a sense of how it was advertised. Viafara responded that the open house was advertised by placing two ads in the local newspapers and also by canvassing some locations like the Library, the Holiday Gas Station, the Senior Citizen's Group, and other businesses in the neighborhood and also a leaflet in the size of postcards were dropped for people to be informed and also to be invited, so in that sense it is our opinion that the number of people that attended numbered about 12 to 16 people came to this open house and they were pleased with the information they received and a promise in case they may have any further considerations, particularly the progress coming from the 140 intersections they would like to receive further information so as soon as they request that information that information will be given to them.

Viafara stated that in addition to those two intersections there was discussion concerning the proposals for Mn220 and the different segments and so far it is our opinion that there is quite a level of support from both the Stakeholders and some community members for the proposed alternatives. He added that we were also, yesterday, graced by the presence of the President from Crystal Sugar that he will be also planning most likely in the company of the fellow representative for TransSystems, given the urgency for mobility in terms of equipment. He said that when he left it was still his impression he was satisfied with the things that he received, comments he received from the consultants and it is possible for us to continue moving in the direction of promoting the round-about and the level of intersection improvements that are being under consideration and also to enjoy their support.

Viafara reported that the next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for around May, and at that time, basically the consultant is expected to present an overall summary of the funding sources that were discussed yesterday, both the City and MnDOT were very keen in showing proposed sources of funding, of course there are issues with eligibility, but what appears to be is that these proposed alternatives could be tied to other projects that MnDOT has for corridor, in that sense it will lessen in part the financial liabilities for the City when these intersections are retrofitted.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

Strandell commented that this whole process he was kind of concerned about the fact that the City Council was not more involved. He said that it appears that these different alternatives, roundabouts, here, there and everywhere else are; but the Council was not involved in this whole plan if it goes forward as planned, anywhere from 1 to 5 years, depending on funding, but everything seems to be set in place without the City Council's involvement or a motion. Viafara responded that they did a presentation at one of the work sessions; they have provided information to the City Hall, either as a matter of update reports or by attending the working sessions; that is the extent and the Mayor has been, in a number of occasions, been attending the Steering Committee meetings, so they have been involved in one level or another on the development that is happening here, and it is his impression that staff from the City has also been in conference with some of the City Council members, at least keeping them informed of what is being transpired. Strandell said that he is initially not in favor or opposed to it, it is just that the whole process he didn't think was done before the City Council or with the Council, they got reports here and there but it didn't seem like their involvement was, or is that much going forward, and if you start spending money on the design and things like that he would hope they have their input in it. Viafara asked what he would suggest they do. Strandell responded that he would just say; as you will see possibilities of funding coming forward, that would be the time to really address it with the Council.

Viafara reported that the next meeting, the final meeting, will entail another presentation before the working session, and that is exactly the purpose. He said that all the alternatives will be, again, discussed and tied, this time, to prospective sources of funding and MnDOT will also be in attendance because part of the funding, given the fact that this is a classified road, and belongs mainly to them, they have already in place a number of improvements that would be related to the final things on here too; for instance issues with some of the signals will be done mainly by MnDOT, and also MnDOT has indicated that some of the legs of the intersections, as far as where they can go and plan the improvements. Strandell stated that he just doesn't want to see a whole lot of money spent on designing without some more involvement by the City, and by the County too as far as 23rd Street. Viafara agreed that that would be our concern as well, so he certainly will keep you advised on this. Strandell commented that at this point if these are just plans on paper, fine, but there needs to be exposure and promotion to the community and to the township. Viafara said they will do that.

Grasser asked if there was an example of an actual operating round-about with the same relationship of the frontage roads; do we have a real world working model that we can validate how they operate, one that is actually working this way. Viafara responded that MnDOT is also considering a number of roundabouts in the State, the closest one to us would be in the City of Thief River Falls, and it would be similar in nature given the nature of the location, similar length to the ones that are being proposed for 23rd and 17th. Haugen added that we will ask MnDOT if they have any examples we can see. Grasser stated that even if they aren't in Minnesota he would be curious to see them. He referred to a picture of a round-about and explained his concern, from an actual operation standpoint, how it performs and if we will end up with accidents because the reaction and visual times get to be too long and exposed. Haugen responded that certainly the focus has been on making sure that certain vehicle types can make the maneuvers, not the sense of ease of maneuver, east of timing.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

U.S.2/U.S.81 Skewed Intersection Study

Kouba reported that they held a public meeting for the U.S.2/U.S.81 Skewed Intersection Study, the Washington and Gateway Intersection, on April 11th. She stated that they advertised the meeting in the Herald; as well as on social media, the MPO's social media and the City of Grand Forks' social media sites; and also sent out postcards to the study area. She said that they had a nice combination of business people, and people from the neighborhoods attend so they got a nice combination of input.

Kouba said that they gave a presentation on what the existing conditions are and asked for what they perceived to be some of the issues that we might have missed. She added that they gave them a handout to write their input on and some handed them in at the end of the meeting, others took them home to fill out and they were asked to return their comments to us by April 26th, so we are still waiting for additional comments. She said that this information and handout is available on the MPO website as well.

CAT/UND Shuttle Merger Study

Kouba reported that the newest project we have going on is the UND Campus Shuttle turnover to Cities Area Transit and we are having public meetings next Wednesday, April 24th. She said that they will hold one on campus and one off campus for the general public and will have a Steering Committee meeting at that time as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

There was no one present for discussion.

OTHER BUSINESS

- a. 2019 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this is our monthly project progress report so that you know where we are at with the key projects that are in our work program.

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 3/16/19 to 4/12/19 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE ATTACHED BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 3/16/19 TO 4/12/19 PERIOD, AS SUBMITTED.

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

Voting Nay: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mock And DeMers

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, April 17th, 2019**

c. Recent State/Federal Partner Staffing Changes

Haugen reported that it was announced earlier that the NDDOT Transportation Director is leaving his office after the Legislative Session, so there will be a change in leadership for the NDDOT.

Haugen stated that also in North Dakota the Federal Highway Division Administrator has shifted over to be the Minnesota Division Administrator, so there will be a new Federal Highway Administrator.

Haugen commented that at the end of last year one person was our main MPO liaison with the Federal Highway North Dakota, that was Stephanie Hickman, and she retired and her position just got filled and it is someone from Montana DOT that will be assuming a federal employment and will begin their duties in May; and then the follow-up person to Stephanie was Richard Durand, and he is moving on to Virginia Division so his position will be vacant and the likelihood is that his position will not be filled until the new Division Administrator position is filled so they will be short staffed for a while. He said that in the interim they made arrangements for Minnesota Federal Highway Division staff to be our main contact person for Federal Highway now so we will be shifting a bit over to the Minnesota Federal Highway Division until they have those positions filled.

Grasser asked how big the federal staff is on the North Dakota side, are there a lot of people. Haugen responded that there are about ten staff people. He commented that finance is a big part of the FHWA, so they have three or four people just on the finance side of things; there are a couple in administration; and there are two division engineers that the State splits, and then they have the environmental staff.

ADJOURNMENT

***MOVED BY GRASSER, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE APRIL 17TH, 2019,
MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:21 P.M.***

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 March 16 through April 12, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-585.22
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,200.60
Liability Check	04/05/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,309.08
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		566 · MN220 N...	-15,279.69
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2019	6701	Professional ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-15,279.69
Business Essentials							
Bill	04/01/2019	Inv. #...	Signature Sta...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-30.80
Bill Pmt -Check	04/01/2019	6715	Signature Sta...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-30.80
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	03/27/2019	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-74.31
Bill Pmt -Check	03/27/2019	6712	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-74.31
City of East Grand Forks							
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. # ...	2019 2nd Qu...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-3,031.58
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2019	6702	2019 2nd Qu...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-3,031.58
Earl Haugen							
Bill	04/09/2019		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-73.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2019	6716	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-73.00
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	04/11/2019	Inv. #...	1st Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-622.12
Bill Pmt -Check	04/11/2019	6720	1st Quarter 2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-622.12
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	6699	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-16.82
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	04/09/2019	Inv. #...	Public Meetin...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-633.13
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2019	6719	Public Meetin...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-633.13
Jairo Viafara.							
Bill	03/26/2019		VOID: Travel ...	206 · Accounts Pay...	X	530 · Educatio...	0.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/26/2019	6711	VOID: Travel ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	0.00
Kadrmaz, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-18,187.28
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-9,580.38
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2019	6703		104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-27,767.66
Bill	03/27/2019	Inv. #...	Services For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-9,908.32
Bill	03/27/2019	Inv. #...	Services For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-3,749.91
Bill Pmt -Check	03/27/2019	6713		104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-13,658.23
Kimley-Horn And Associates, Inc.							
Bill	04/09/2019	Inv. #...	For Services ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		545 · Transpor...	-5,781.89
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2019	6717	For Services ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,781.89
Knight Printing							
Bill	03/29/2019	Inv. #...	Printing Fees ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-1,091.25
Bill Pmt -Check	03/29/2019	6714	Printing Fees ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,091.25
Liberty Business Systems, INC.							
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-134.42
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2019	6704	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-134.42
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	NWR...		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-165.00
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	6700		104 · Checking	X	215 · Disability...	-91.30
Mike's							
Bill	03/20/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-78.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/20/2019	6698	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-78.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-208.00
Liability Check	04/05/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-208.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	6707		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-117.77
Liability Check	03/22/2019	6708		104 · Checking	X	219 · Life Insur...	-14.00
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	04/05/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
NDPERS							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,819.16
Liability Check	03/22/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,853.50

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 March 16 through April 12, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
North Dakota State University							
Bill	04/09/2019	Inv. #...	Half Payment...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-27,844.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/09/2019	6718	Half Payment...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-27,844.00
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	03/21/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-8,188.56
Liability Check	04/03/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-7,961.57
Safe Kids Grand Forks							
Bill	03/26/2019		Cost For Safe...	206 · Accounts Pay...		525 · Citizens ...	-40.00
Bill Pmt -Check	03/26/2019	6710	Cost For Safe...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-40.00
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,516.25
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-454.98
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2019	6705		104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-1,971.23
Bill	03/22/2019	Inv. #...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-4,976.79
Bill	03/22/2019	11513...	Professional ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,750.72
Bill Pmt -Check	03/22/2019	6706		104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-6,727.51
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	03/22/2019	6709		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-158.60
State Tax Commissioner							
Liability Check	04/01/2019	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-543.00
Teri Kouba							
Bill	04/11/2019		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-14.00
Bill Pmt -Check	04/11/2019	6721	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-14.00