

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

**Wednesday, June 19th, 2019 – 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the June 19th, 2019, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:08 p.m.

CALL OF ROLL

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Clarence Vetter, Mike Powers, Warren Strandell, Marc DeMers, Bob Rost, Al Grasser, Ken Vein (via conference call), and Jeannie Mock.

Guest(s) were: Brad Gengler, Grand Forks Planning; David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering; Sandy Norby, Resident; Lisa Simonson, Resident; Clark Piepkorn, Resident; Michael Huot, Resident; Kevin Kouba, Resident; Jim Hansen, Resident; Katy Johnson, Resident; Arch Simonson, Resident; Bret Weber, Grand Forks City Councilman; and Alesha Hansen, Resident.

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 MAY 22ND, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO APPROVE THE MAY 22ND, 2019 MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF EXECUTION OF CONTRACT WITH KLJ FOR DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Haugen reported that they issued the RFP back in March and received four proposals. He said that all four firms were interviewed and the Selection Committee is recommending we enter into a contract with KLJ to do the Downtown Transportation Plan. He added that KLJ's scope of work does reflect what RFP requested so staff is recommending approval of the execution of a contract with KLJ.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

Haugen stated that there are a couple of things noted in the staff report. He explained that KLJ, in their proposal, identified some value added items; four of them in particular, and they are things that were outside of the scope of work that we asked the consultants to respond to.

Haugen reported that the four items are listed in the staff report, however two of them are not eligible per NDDOT decision to be under this contract. He stated that the first one that isn't eligible is the one-way pair analysis from University Avenue to Gateway Drive on North 3rd and North 4th Streets. He added that the cost of this is roughly \$8,000; and the City of Grand Forks' staff has not really expressed interest in doing it, but if it were to be pursued it would have to be paid 100% locally. Grasser asked why this project wouldn't be eligible for federal funding. Haugen responded that it wasn't identified as a specific request to study the one way pairs.

Haugen commented that the other one that isn't eligible; part of KLJ's team is a subconsultant, RDG, and that firm is the lead firm on the Grand Forks Downtown Action Plan process. He said that KLJ was proposing to do some additional work through RDG on the East Grand Forks side, and it is KLJ's opinion to bring the East Grand Forks side up to the same downtown redevelopment concepts that the Grand Forks side has. He stated that, again, that is something outside of our scope, and is roughly a \$60,000 added value that East Grand Forks would have to pay for. He added that they haven't heard yet if it is something that East Grand Forks is interested in or not.

Ken Vein joined the meeting.

Haugen stated that there were two added value items that were determined to be eligible if the MPO wanted to include them. He said that the first one is connected and automated vehicles (CAV), with a cost of \$10,500, but based on what we saw from the parking study, this area isn't seen as having much impact on our parking demand and supply; and typically parking demand and supply relates to traffic, so again from MPO staff, and from feedback we got from both City staff, there appears to be a lack of interest in pursuing this.

Haugen reported that the fourth activity offers more enhanced public engagement. He commented that there are two activities under this item; one was media buys and social media, but we aren't suggesting that this is something we execute; but the other one is something that we might want to consider, particularly on the bicycle side. He stated that through the Downtown Action Plan, through the DeMers Avenue Reconstruction, through the Bike Plan Update there has been a lot of discussion and different facilities proposed, particularly for bicycles in the downtown area, so the value added would be to try to have more engagement of anyone interested in the downtown to visit certain areas of both downtowns to talk specifically about the biking issue and possible solutions; so that is what that activity would be for an extra \$3,200.

Haugen commented that there will still be a technical review of those issues, so this would just be something to engage more stakeholders, specifically about the bike facilities in downtown Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. He said that, again, a lot of discussion has taken place at those other bike facilities options, it might

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

be of value to add that to the contract if the MPO desired, but right now Staff is recommending the base, not to exceed \$120,000, so if you decided you wanted to add this in the base amount would increase to \$124,000. He added that, just to tie this up, the East Grand Forks value added, if East Grand Forks decided to take that on; it is the consultant's opinion is that it would delay the start of our study a couple of months, but it gives East Grand Forks the opportunity to be brought up, so whatever action we take today keep that in mind that it might push our completion date back a few months to 2020.

Grasser stated that on the Grand Forks side they have been doing a pretty fair amount of pop-up meetings and things like that so he isn't sure, but this seems like this would overlap that to a degree on the Grand Forks side, so he isn't sure of its value, if it would be worth delaying the project for two months in order to have that included. Haugen responded that the delay would only be if we do the East Grand Forks item, not the bike added public engagement. DeMers added that East Grand Forks doesn't have a formal recommendation yet on this, but it isn't high on their priority list right now.

Haugen reiterated that it is only the Redevelopment Concepts for East Grand Forks item that would cause delay of completion of the project.

Grasser said that he has a comment on the proposal for services; in the original RFP they talk about identifying the traffic impacts and things at 2030 and at 2045, but when he goes through their detailed scope of work they only talk about 2045. Haugen responded that it is an omission on the scope of work, but it does include both 2030 and 2045. Grasser stated that he brought that up because he thought that was one of the more important pieces that we were trying to get; we have a number of facilities that are going to be opening up downtown in the next two to five years and we wanted to see what kind of traffic impacts there might be.

DeMers asked what the timeline for approval if East Grand Forks were to decide it wants to include the redevelopment concept item on. Haugen responded that if they decide they want to add it on; as identified in the report we could add it to the contract with KLJ and RDG that the MPO has as an addendum or, and he knows that the NDDOT would prefer it, as a separate contract between the City and KLJ and RDG. DeMers said, then that we can proceed with this and then we can add it up to 30 days? Haugen responded that he would think by the end of July you should have your decision made.

MOVED BY DEMERS TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT WITH KLJ FOR THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY.

Grasser commented that they haven't talked about any additional options on the Grand Forks side, and he would defer to the Council Representatives. He added that he isn't sure what is all planned for engagement already downtown, but last year they had pretty heavy public engagement in the downtown with the pop-ups and those types of things.

DeMers asked what the deadline is for addition of any of the other additional items. Haugen responded that it would be preferable to add them now, but if we decide to do any a month or two months from now we would just process a contract amendment, a scope amendment, to add them in then.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

Grasser said that if East Grand Forks thinks it is important he thinks you would lead on that; it isn't a large dollar amount. DeMers stated, then, do you just want to go with the base dollar now. Grasser responded that his preference would probably just do the base at this point in time and then do an amendment later if needed. DeMers asked if there was a downside to doing it that way. Haugen responded that it would just be a matter of processing contract amendments, so not much work involved. DeMers said that he doesn't want to go forward without formal East Grand Forks Council action, it doesn't seem like anybody has any real strong feelings with going forward with it, and also we don't really have the authority to spend money, especially on the East Grand Forks side, so his motion would be for just the base contract.

MOTION, AS DISCUSSED, WOULD BE – MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE EXECUTION OF THE CONTRACT WITH KLJ FOR THE DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$120,000.

***Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Strandell, Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, and Vein
Voting Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None***

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FINAL EGF ROW ADA TRANSITION PLAN

Kouba reported that the final draft of this was first presented back in December or January, but at that time our federal partners requested that we include the transit information for the City of East Grand Forks be included as well. She stated that that information has now been provided by the City's Engineers, and has been inputted into the plan we now have all the information that our Federal Partners require of us to do, which included how many sheltered stops, if they are compliant, and other such information. She said that the plan was approved by the City of East Grand Forks' City Council at their meeting last evening.

Grasser asked who the consultant was for the project, and what was the cost. Kouba responded that the consultant was SRF, but she doesn't have the actual project cost right now. (The cost of the project was \$34,998.00). Grasser stated that he was just wondering in the event Grand Forks decides to pursue a similar project. Kouba said that the cost would be higher for Grand Forks because of the size of the City itself.

MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE FINAL DRAFT OF THE EAST GRAND FORKS ADA TRANSITION PLAN FOR PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY, AS SUBMITTED.

***Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Strandell, Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, and Vein
Voting Nay: None
Abstain: None
Absent: None***

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

MATTER OF UPDATE ON UND/CAT MERGER STUDY

Kouba reported that this is an update on how far we are with this study. She said that as she presented last month; if this merger should go through Cities Area Transit wouldn't actually start doing anything until August of 2020.

Kouba commented that they finally have some final numbers from Cities Area Transit as to what it would cost them to provide this service, and we presented last month how volatile UND's cost to do the service is, specifically how much it costs them to lease their buses from the State Fleet.

Vetter said that it appears that it is cheaper to run it under Cities Area Transit than to let UND continue to run it. Kouba responded that it is comparable. She added that the biggest issue is the volatility of costs and CAT being able to run it at a comparable cost without volatility, they can budget for it much better.

Mock asked if there is any concern with the old President leaving and a new one coming in and whether or not the new one will be supportive of this. Kouba responded that they have not heard anything from the university as to whether or not that is a concern for their transportation department, but she doesn't believe so considering how this campus shuttle will relate to how they want to do parking now and into the future, so it will be complimentary to that parking issue.

Haugen commented that UND, by having Cities Area Transit provide the service, would have a cost that is comparable to what their average cost has been for the last five years and they also would now have a very steady cost to budget in the future whereby their use of the State Fleet Services, as you saw last month, creates a volatility of the cost and causes budget issues, so having a more steady budget process, plus being able to provide the same service, it seems like a pretty good deal.

**MATTER OF POSSIBLE WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT FOR 32ND AVENUE BRIDGE
FEASIBILITY STUDY**

Haugen reported that last month, in your discussions about how to move forward with additional river crossings, you asked staff to look at our work program to see what could possibly be done in order to make movement on both the Merrifield and 32nd Avenue Bridges.

Haugen stated that we have asked both counties to schedule a meeting, and Mr. Rost just told him that it will be scheduled in the near future for both counties to discuss moving forward with the Merrifield Bridge, to start that process.

Haugen commented that with the Merrifield Bridge process moving forward, from a staff perspective, the reason why Merrifield might be able to move forward is because ten years ago we did a Bridge Feasibility Study for that corridor, and so when you asked staff what our work program could do for 32nd Avenue we are suggesting that we do a similar corridor study as we did on Merrifield for 32nd, and

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

included in the packet was the actual RFP we issued back then for Merrifield. He pointed out that we do note that there are some similarities, but there are also two major differences; first Merrifield also had the Cole Creek issue, and nothing like that exists at 32nd Avenue, additional drainage; but what does exist there that didn't exist at Merrifield was an urban setting versus a rural setting, so we are suggesting that we could do a very similar study highlighting those differences in the RFP. He said that the cost estimate is inflated to year of expenditure from what we paid back then for the Merrifield study, so we are suggesting a budget of \$110,000 for consultant costs. He added that currently our work program has all of its money allocated to activities, so in order for the MPO to do anything in 2020 it would have to move some things out.

Haugen stated that the first thing that they identified is going to be delayed and not start in 2020 anyway; just as you heard with the merger of UND/CAT, it would not start until the fall of 2020, and the purpose is to have CAT run the existing routes for a couple of semesters to get their feet underneath the whole system and better understand how it relates to the rest of the system, so the study was initially going to be done in 2020 because CAT was initially going to start the operation in the fall of 2019, but what that delay then the route study can be delayed and that is a major \$60,000 item.

Haugen said that there are three other items that are less substantial in cost; the first one is annually we do school safety work, and that item could be rolled into the RFP itself for 32nd Avenue. He stated that he did talk about the difference of 32nd being in an urban setting; there were no schools along the Merrifield Corridor, there are schools on the 32nd Avenue Corridor, so we can add into the scope of work the school safety issue that wasn't in the Merrifield RFP.

Haugen commented that we also have a traffic count program. He explained that we started it many years ago with the video cameras that are counting traffic at all of the intersections, and each year we had a line item for additional cameras for any new signals that have been put into place, and/or to upgrade current signals to newer video cameras, so what this would do would be that we could still have counting going on in the current locations, but it would delay a year anything new that is brought into 2020. He added that we wouldn't have the cost of ATAC's help in updating any of the new signals or to retrofit any existing signals, we wouldn't be counting those locations for an additional 12 month period.

Haugen stated that the last item is that we have a little reserve fund for things that might pop up throughout the year called technical assistance that we can hold off on.

Haugen said that with those four items, and with the addition of school safety being added to the scope of work, that would free up the funds to do the 32nd Avenue Study. He pointed out that we wouldn't be able to start any work on 32nd until 2020, and right now all we have from staff's point of view is, this is what we did, we have not drafted anything that says that this will be what the 32nd Avenue study will be, we have not drafted that actual work program amendment document to present for your consideration either. He added that our understanding from last month's meeting was that you wanted to get some idea of what it would be and what it would take to do and that is what we think we are providing you this month; we think we can do something similar to what we did at Merrifield, we think the cost will be inflated to \$110,000, and these would be the items that staff identified that could be delayed or worked into the 32nd Avenue Scope of Work.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

Grasser stated that he has a couple of comments and questions; on the budget side are we talking about transferring all of those four line items, basically reducing them all to zero or are there some that you would retain some dollar amount in there because when he totals them up he thinks we are over the \$110,000 needed for the consultant. Haugen responded that the total is \$127,000, with \$110,000 for the consultant but the total budget would be \$127,000 for MPO costs as well. Grasser said, then, that that would reduce all of those line items to zero. Haugen responded that that is correct.

Grasser said that early on he thought we talked about maybe delaying some of the land use planning; is there a reason why we aren't looking at making any shifts in that particular line item. Haugen responded that it is more important to keep them on schedule, however there is a possibility that we could change the scope of work for the land use plans, or bridge over another year, so we would fund them in split years, but we identified these four items as a way to fund 32nd and not impact the land use plans. Grasser commented that he struggles a little bit losing the traffic counts. He said that another comment he will make is that one of the things that changes 32nd relative to Merrifield from a technical standpoint, that he thinks is really important, is to find out how the hydraulic impacts the bridge. He added that from his perspective there are three really major things, broad categories on a bridge that can kind of make or break moving forward with a bridge; one is public reaction, the other is funding which we have already identified as an additional challenge, and the third is what might the hydraulic impacts be; if we find out that there is really no good alternatives, or mitigated flooding impacts we have to spend "x" additional dollars to accomplish it at this location, he thinks it is important to know that so we have a good understanding of the dollars.

Grasser stated that we have heard from the 32nd Avenue neighborhood that in their world they would prefer that the 32nd Avenue Bridge option kind of go away and not come back for consideration, and to him one of the ways that we would limit future considerations, if we find out that there is some sort of hydraulic issue going on there that we can't address, that costs \$50 million dollars, that would then carry on into the future; and he isn't predicting that, he is just saying that if doing the hydraulic study has mixed feelings, it may show that there are some specific challenges, but if it doesn't it does move the bridge kind of one step forward, but he is just saying that we should have that answer because that is one of the next highest priorities in figuring out if a bridge at this location is really feasible; if it impacts our flood insurance or flood protection and potentially the dollars associated with it.

Grasser commented that he struggles with the scope, as he said the scope isn't complete on here, but he thinks we do need to look at a more detailed scope, and, again, from his perspective he thinks hydraulics is one of the top priorities in figuring this out, that is one of the black box unknown that we really have out there right now.

Haugen responded that that was one of the big scopes of the Merrifield Feasibility report, the hydraulics. Grasser said, though, that this will be ratcheted up a little bit higher, again, just because we now have a flood protection project in place that has tighter criteria to it.

DeMers stated that it isn't just hydraulics, he would imagine that any bridge likely is regulatory in general, and that is why we need to do that type of feasibility because we can't know that unless it is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

done. Grasser responded that from a regulatory standpoint you're not allowed to have any hydraulic impacts and so we know that that will be one of the requirements. He added that the other question is; we are pretty sure that when the FEMA does an update on the river that the next round, it will probably be even higher than they are now so we just want to make sure that we don't inadvertently impact a flood issue; it has more potential as a low level bridge than a high level bridge, even a high level if you put a couple of piers in the river, it will cause an impact to the flood levels.

DeMers said that it mentions in here the splitting costs over separate cycles, is that maybe something that is available for this kind of feasibility study, could we separate that in 2020 and 2021. Haugen responded that we could do that. He explained that if you wanted to leave these four that are suggested, somewhat in place, the only other activity that we have are the land use plans and we would finance them over two program years, and we would have to finance this over those same two work program years, but we weren't suggesting impacting the land use plans, but you could still finalize the funds in 2021. He reiterated that right now we have a 2019 and 2020 work program, we don't have a 2021 year committed to, and so there will be some angst from our State and Federal partners in having a project carry forward into a new two-year work program, but it is doable.

DeMers asked what the ATAC stuff was that Mr. Haugen mentioned could be reprogrammed. Haugen responded that it is a \$25,000 total, and again if there are new signals and/or updates to existing signals, ATAC is able to go into the video cameras and set them up so that they can count the traffic. He said that the existing ones would still be counting traffic, it would only affect new implementation.

Discussion on existing and new signal capture ensued.

DeMers asked if this item was just for information or do we need a recommendation from the board. Haugen responded that if you want to move forward we would like to have direction for staff to draft up a true 32nd Avenue Feasibility scope of work and a true work program amendment to swap these four studies, or however you want to do it, and to propose a new work program for 2020. He said that right now, as he understood it, was we just wanted to get some sense of can it be done and what it would look like; and we provided that to you today but there is still some work to be done to finalize it so the next step would be for us to draft that up. He added that, again, this is not by any means getting it to shovel ready project status, it is still a very high reconnaissance level, but it answers a couple key questions, hydraulics being one of the top ones, and it gets us a better sense of cost more specific to this site versus how we did it in the transportation plan where we used planning level concepts, this would be more specific.

Vein stated that the board asked staff to take a look at this issue to see how we might do it, and he heard Mr. Haugen say that he would draft a potential amendment and look at the RFP language and then both of those would come back to the next MPO meeting, is that correct. Haugen responded that he would ask that it be brought back to the August meetings; with the 4th of July holiday, vacations, state and federal partner review is key and he doesn't know if they will process it quick enough to have it ready for our July meetings. Vein said, though, that the request will be to continue this process, and you

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

would draft an official amendment that would then be submitted to the DOT, correct. Haugen responded that it would be reviewed by the DOT before the MPO would take action on it, but if in August the MPO decides to take action and approve it then it would be formally presented to the DOT.

Vein said that when you put the RFP together we can make sure that we are getting the issue of, and he knows that Mr. Grasser spoke to this, the hydraulics, and to certainly try to address all the issues with school and pedestrian safety and look at some of the cost estimates and the traffic safety issues that we would want to be incorporated into the RFP, correct. Haugen responded that that is what we would include in the draft. Vein said, then, that at the August meeting we will see some more exact wording of each of those items and then we would vote on it at that time, correct. Haugen responded that it would go through the normal process; your Technical Advisory Committee would first review it and improve it for your consideration at your August meeting for final approval. Vein said that for him this makes the most sense, as it is really hard to make any approval right now until we see what those documents will look like, so it makes sense so he would like to make the motion to approve moving forward with those two items.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE DRAFTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2020 WORK PROGRAM TO DELAY THE FOUR CURRENTLY PROGRAMMED STUDIES AS DISCUSSED AND TO INCLUDE A 32ND AVENUE SOUTH BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY, AND TO DEVELOP THE RFP.

AUDIENCE DISCUSSION

Mike Huot, resident, stated that he has been coming to these meetings quite a while and he thinks the most basic thing is the “why”. He said that he still doesn’t understand why. He commented that he read through the Merrifield Feasibility Study and there seemed to be a lot of momentum, and then it just died; he doesn’t know why, but it just died, and now we have another bridge we are going to try to start this whole feasibility thing again without a real “why”. He said he doesn’t understand why 32nd, he truly understands 32nd if it was something to do or it had to be within the flood protection and you had to be there to get funding, he could understand that, but since we are doing a wet bridge that is off the table, so he is trying to figure out the “why”. He stated that what we do know is that the Merrifield would instantaneously help the farm issue we have been talking about, instantaneously we already have a study that tells us what we have to do without spending a lot of money to see whether we can do it, and it seemed to have a little bit more public acceptance, and then it just died, so actually 2020 was the time it was supposed to be finalized, which is next year, so just as we are starting this whole process again without a why, and you and he have had great discussions, and as a matter of fact he thinks they have become friends as we still discuss this, but he doesn’t understand why, can someone tell him why 32nd is so advantageous to the east side he could grab on to it but when he looks at the pictures, look where it is going to go and where it is going to end up, and he looks at the Grand Forks side and he looks at the traffic studies, it is very opaque, there is really no answer, you can look at a report and it depends on who is writing it what the outcome is, so there really isn’t anything to grab on to and one gentleman at the last meeting said, and there weren’t a lot of East Grand Forks residents there, but the two things that

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

really stood out to him was that our Mayor said he didn't have any answers and then East Grand Forks' Mayor said we need a neighborhood bridge. He said that he doesn't know what a neighborhood bridge is, but where it is going into doesn't look like much of a neighborhood, and we all know the towns are going south and, in fact, when you drive out to the corridor you probably miss it before you notice you were there, that is the proximity of it right now. He stated that he isn't saying yes or no he just wants to know the why, why that location, and it definitely not going to help the Reeves Drive issue as a stand-alone, so really he doesn't know what we are getting into and he doesn't really have anything to say yay or nay to, and as far as the County we are talking two different bridges, two different aspects, why can't the two counties and cities get together and share some things, maybe even how to get money to build a bridge that won't flood, but those discussions aren't being had, it seems like there are two different entities discussing stuff, and ultimately it is all the same, East Grand Forks and Grand Forks money, he doesn't see why there are two different county and township meetings and city meetings with the same result. He added that, again, the Merrifield Road already has some positives going, but we already know it will have a direct impact; but the Cole Creek thing he has no idea what that all means, but maybe we can spend some money and see if that is an issue anymore, we have already spent \$100,000 or so on that one and it is just sitting there doing nothing.

Vetter responded that there are two bridges and each bridge serves a different purpose; the Merrifield one takes all the truck traffic and the regional traffic, but it won't do anything for Reeves, Belmont, Bygland Road, or the Point Bridge. He said, however, that 32nd helps alleviate that traffic on Belmont, Reeves, and Bygland Road and also some of the traffic off the "curvy" bridge.

Vetter commented that through our traffic study the Minnesota Avenue, the curvy bridge, has an "F" rating so we have to do something to alleviate the traffic off that bridge or it is going to fail. He added that when we did the studies Elks Drive, 17th Avenue, 32nd Avenue, 47th Avenue, when we looked at all of those 32nd Avenue always rose to the top. Audience members said it rises to the top for East Grand Forks. Vetter responded that it is for both sides. Audience members asked why not 47th Avenue; there was a sign, and it was a designated bridge corridor for years and years and that is why the homes were built the way they were, that is why it is widened, the City spent the money on a bigger section and you can get on the Interstate; you go there and it is like "boom", you look down there and you can go across the river right down 47th and you're not affecting a neighborhood and schools. Vetter stated that there is a neighborhood on 47th also, but when he looks at the traffic studies. Audience member said that she just doesn't understand why there is not a study for that. Vetter responded that we did study 47th Avenue and 47th on the East Grand Forks side of the river is a gravel road and it is way too far south and your cost/benefit ratio doesn't warrant a bridge on 47th and so we won't get any funding for it. Audience member stated that we are in North Dakota. Audience member stated that 32nd is a gravel road too. Vetter responded that it isn't. Audience member stated that she feels that we are just doing this for East Grand Forks, Grand Forks does not want it on 32nd. Vetter responded that the MPO is tasked with transportation for the whole community, not just Grand Forks and not just East Grand Forks, we look at the whole community. Audience member asked what about the Grand Forks community. Audience member said it is just so silly. Audience member stated that it weighs heavily on East Grand Forks it does not weigh heavily on the Grand Forks side, that connection to the Interstate was off 47th in the future.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

Clark Piepkorn, resident, said that there are just a couple of things he would like to add; when we are talking about grades one of the grades the MPO gave the corner of 32nd and Belmont, currently, was an “F”, and with an additional 8,000 cars somehow they are going to change it to a “C”. He said the other issue is he owns a couple of properties right on Highway 2 and Mill Road within a couple of blocks, most of you people may have had an opportunity to see what happens when there is a flood event in our communities; the traffic flow, we don’t need studies, if you couldn’t see the traffic coming in the morning from East Grand Forks into Grand Forks, when he went to his property he couldn’t see the end of the line over the bridge and when he tried to get to his property at ten after five he was backed up to the cemetery, almost to Columbia road, but the traffic coming west was normal; East Grand Forks, yes those bridges are important, but, sorry on the Grand Forks side the traffic flowing the other way at those times of day during the flood event was normal, there was no issue for him getting over to East Grand Forks in the morning with just the one bridge, and yet the other way it was different and hopefully you people had an opportunity to actually witness that. He added that he did ask Ms. Kouba, he went to a meeting, and he asked her to go there the next morning at 8:00 and take a look to the right at 8:00 in the morning because she wouldn’t be able to see the end of the traffic. He said that there is no way it is 50/50, no possible way, and that is proof.

Audience member said that she can interject that she lives a block of the 47th Avenue corridor and she would, as a homeowner and community member, and with the kids that are at Kelly now and going to be at Schroeder, she would rather that bridge be built on 47th Avenue South, essentially in her backyard, than on 32nd Avenue where you are impacting so many families that have their homes there. She added that she understands needing traffic off the Point Bridge, but not at the detriment of another already established neighborhood. She commented that Phoenix Elementary, not that she is saying that we don’t want a bridge anywhere, Phoenix Elementary was built on a bridge route, that school was built after that bridge was already up, it makes no sense to her to put a bridge at 32nd Avenue when we already know there are going to be problems for homeowners, for community members, for kids. She said put it at 47th, makes a lot of sense to put it at Merrifield. She added that at their meeting a couple of months ago they had someone that lives in East Grand Forks there; what difference does it make if you have to drive another two miles to cross at Merrifield and at what cost does that have on both sides if you put a bridge in that route area.

Audience member commented that she would like to mention the Kennedy Bridge, it is essential for flood time and right now with construction on DeMers probably some people are taking the Kennedy Bridge versus the Southend Bridge, and during the flood, and maybe she is the only one that felt this way, but going back and forth for appointments, when she went over the Kennedy Bridge she honest to god said a prayer that it didn’t fall. She said that she knows there has been construction on it and she doesn’t question it right now at all, but the stress that is put on the bridge, that is not a normal day, the major stress that is put on it at different time frames, it makes her nervous to go over it, she doesn’t feel it will fail anytime coming up but if there is not another bridge that is going to carry the weight and share that in the next few years or so that bridge is going to faster than what it is probably projected to and then you are going to have the expense of that bridge in addition to everything that is going on.

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

Grasser stated that there are a couple of issues going on, and he understands, he heard from the residents before that your desire is that the discussion of the 32nd Bridge go away and never come back, right, but he doesn't know if there is any way of making that happen exactly, but he is trying to get the priorities in his head so correct him if he is wrong, but the Cities and the MPO have both priorities the Merrifield Bridge as the top priority, correct. Haugen responded that that used to be a phasing strategy in our plan but it was removed this last time. Grasser said, then, that we prioritized the Merrifield Bridge, which he thinks is also further along in the bureaucratic process because we have done at least one study and we are actually, on that one, he thinks the inference was with the Joint County Commission meetings is that we are actually moving forward to have a joint county meeting, correct. He said, then, that in the process we are moving Merrifield ahead of 32nd, it is ahead of 32nd relative to studies and the bureaucratic processes, and we start putting timelines on money, 32nd will be a long ways away; now that doesn't solve the issue of not wanting it to never come back again, but he thinks with his perception, a bridge is still financially, for no other reason, as long as we maintain priority with Merrifield, that is going to be tough in an of itself, but he just wanted to make sure we are all on the same line on where the priorities are which is likely the first bridge to happen.

Audience member commented that the mention of everything moving south, we are as a city moving south and it just doesn't seem like even it if is put on the back burner, what that does to our property values and everything. She said that there are homes right there, they have three homes for sale in their neighborhood already and they are sitting on them because of this talk of a bridge, and it affects the ability for someone to sell their home, and it is like there are no homes out there, eventually we are going to see more shopping centers, more restaurants, so she doesn't understand why with us moving south, you put a bridge out there and East Grand Forks will probably build south too, it doesn't make any sense to her and it is the "why", she doesn't understand.

Audience member asked Mr. Haugen for clarification on Mr. Grasser's question; did you say it is correct that Merrifield is a priority or it isn't a priority because he thinks he heard you say that Merrifield is no longer a priority. Haugen responded that in past plans we had the Merrifield Bridge being constructed first, but this plan we do not have the conditional phasing of one bridge prior to the other bridge. Audience member asked if there is a way for them to get that priority back in your thought process, is that something that you feel would be appropriate. He added that as witness this spring, there is definitely a need for another dry bridge in this community for emergency vehicles, etc.. He said that that costs that they have been shown, all the ones in town, the dry bridges running from Elks at \$21 million to \$29 million at 32nd and 47th, but a dry bridge at Merrifield is \$28 million dollars. He stated that, again, it goes back to the hydraulic issues; is there a way for them to try to, as your organization, to see if you can readdress that issue.

Huot commented that he would pose the question, the study was done in 2004, you haven't done nothing since 2004, if the Merrifield Bridge was in existence today would we be talking about the 32nd Bridge, and if we were we would actually have great data to say we need the 32nd Bridge; best case scenario is we save \$20 to \$30 million dollars; worse case scenario we at par, that is the gray that he has been talking about as far as it is two different events, well maybe we are building one unnecessarily, he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

doesn't think we have that kind of cash where we can hedge that, but you haven't done nothing on Merrifield since 2004, because the study was done in 2004, so he doesn't know if you do a study on 32nd are you not going to touch it for 20 years, what does that mean.

Audience member stated that this may or may not relate to this, but it is a question that just keeps coming up in her mind, but she went to the City Council meeting in December, around December 13th, and vibe, maybe not accurate, the vibe she was getting at that meeting was that the community members that were going to be impacted by a 32nd Avenue Bridge, they didn't even know that it was back on the table again, and then there was this feeling like, "oh if we don't get this MPO plan approved all this other funding is going to be halted until we have an approved plan" and that deadline was December 31st, so she feels like they were not engaged in the process leading up to December and now they are sitting here trying to figure out, well wait a second, is Merrifield first before 32nd, is it not, she feels like our Grand Forks Council members are also asking that same question.

DeMers said that he would like to comment on the prioritization issue. He said that he thinks that with the removal of the prioritization it allows the separate jurisdictions to kind of take their leads. He explained that one of the problems is the Cities aren't going to be able to affect a Merrifield Bridge because it is all outside their jurisdictions, and as they are moving in their separate spheres, and looking at their separate pots of money, we don't want to constrain it to "yes we are going to build a Merrifield Bridge and then all of a sudden some sort of City Transportation Grant funding comes up and you eliminate the possibility of Cities using it. He added that right now with big Build dollars out there, he is encouraged by the Counties trying to get together, he thinks they need a meeting to coordinate their schedules, but he thinks that if they are moving forward there is money out there, those big Build dollars, and he doesn't anticipate that not happening, but the plan hasn't changed, it really has stayed the same since 2003/2004, so we just eliminated the prioritization so that, in his opinion, different jurisdictions can go after different dollars whenever they need to.

Audience member asked if the Grand Forks City Council, at some point, ask the MPO to move forward with a study to get an RFP on 32nd Avenue, was there a meeting when that took place that the Grand Forks City Council asked that of the MPO. Vetter responded that there is a federal requirement that we do a five year transportation plan, and the MPO is in charge of the five year transportation plan so every five years we update the plan. Audience member said, then that this started back in 2003 and has been updated every five years since. Vetter responded that that is correct. He added that we have had transportation plans prior to 2003. Haugen added that the first Grand Forks/East Grand Forks joint plan was in 1969. Audience member asked, though, that as far as 32nd being designated, what year was that. Haugen responded that it was designated in 2004.

Vein commented that he understands, in listening to the questions that are being asked, and many of them are very good; but he thinks that we need to put kind of, there are so many questions that still linger here that need to be answered. He added that the reason he would like to do the study is, if we look at the hydraulics we may find that a bridge is not even possible at this location because of hydraulic impacts, and if that is the case then we can easily take this off the table, but if it works then we know

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

that moving forward. He said that there are issues with pedestrian safety and school safety, and he agrees with that, and we need to look at that because if we can't address pedestrian and child safety, that certainly would impact whether or not we would move forward, and then we talked about the cost estimate, and if those estimates are more detailed through a study, and it is unaffordable that makes a difference as well as the impacts of traffic on safety throughout the community, so he guess he envisions that this type of study that would actually answer some of those questions, it will make it much easier to figure out if it even can move forward, and that is why he made the motion and why he would support that we at least get these amendments made and the RFP put together to make sure that all of those critical things are included in the project before we would move the project forward.

Audience member asked how much it was again, and who pays for the study, is it \$127,000. Vetter responded that the MPO pays for it with federal and local dollars.

Vetter asked, there is a motion and a second on the floor, so should we do roll call and move this on.

Mock asked if what we are moving forward is to see what the amendment would be and what the RFP would be. Vetter responded that that is correct. Mock said then, that in terms of people and their concerns, this isn't a motion to forward the bridge at 32nd, it is a motion to look at what a study would include. Vetter responded that this is correct, and added that it will direct the staff to update the 2019-2020 Work Program and to develop the RFP. Mock asked if that would come back to the MPO Board in August for their review and approval, and then will it go to the City Councils. Haugen responded that it would be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee.

Weber asked if there would be a county meeting before this is done. Rost responded that there will as soon as the two County Boards can get together. He said that they just talked about it yesterday, but a time hasn't yet been set.

Mock asked if, in terms of the Merrifield feasibility work that has been done, is that something that is still up-to-date or is it something that needs be brought up-to-date. Haugen responded that that would be part of the movement going forward, they will have to make a decision on that with the lead state and federal agency as to what needs to be updated in that document, if anything. Audience member asked who would pay for that. Haugen responded that the initial agencies to look at it would be the two counties. Mock asked if staff envisioned that coming back to us as a priority or would that just be within the counties. Haugen responded that it would be within the counties and they will then keep us up-to-date on the progress of it moving through planning and the project development, and possibly through programming. Mock asked, to get that RFP, would we get an idea; we'd look at the hydraulics, would we also look at the impacts to the greenway and the floodway system so we will have a better idea of things like cost and engagement and things like that because there are a lot of sensitivities in that greenway and neighborhood, those are concerns, so would you start to get a sense of that. Haugen responded that we would.

Strandell commented that he has heard some support for a 47th Avenue Bridge, and he is kind of inclined to support that spot too; and his being a County Commissioner he is actually a tight-wad. He

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

stated that first of all he thinks we could build one bridge versus two, just build one bridge so it can handle truck traffic and everything else at the interchange on the North Dakota side. He added that it has been said that you couldn't get a bridge in place sooner than in the next ten years, and in ten years what kind of growth have we had in the two cities, we are both going south, and he thinks it would fit if we make the plan now and reserve the right-of-ways and everything else, he would think it would be a wise investment, so he isn't going to support this motion.

Mock stated that she lives by the Point Bridge and there is a huge traffic concern in that area and on Reeves and Belmont, and they have very very real traffic concerns. She said that she has been very close to having accidents trying to get out, so it is a very real impact right now, so what does something like a 47th or Merrifield Bridge do for the traffic concerns by the Point Bridge and the Reeves and Belmont areas. Haugen responded that from a traffic modeling perspective Merrifield does little to none for the Point Bridge and Minnesota/4th Avenue Corridor, it does provide some decrease in traffic volume but not to a degree that improves it substantially. He said that 47th Avenue would have some improvement, but not as much as 32nd, Elks or 17th would provide, so it would improve it to a degree but not as well as other locations would. He added that when you look at the modeling 47th does not provide as much relief to the Kennedy traffic as 32nd or Elks or 17th would either, so it is providing better mitigation to needs for both the Kennedy and the Point. Audience member asked if this was based on the study that was done back in 2004 or are you basing it on current day information with the way the City of Grand Forks is growing. Haugen responded that it is based on current day information. Audience member asked where that information is being pulled from when the last study was done in 2004. Haugen responded that the study that we just adopted in December contains all this information, adding that he can get her name and number and direct her to the study on-line.

Huot commented that one thing he would say about that study is a lot of it simulated, because we had some highwater and flood situations and bridge closing and the Kennedy being worked on, so a lot of it was simulated so he would post the question; when you talk about alleviating traffic time is important to people, and if he is going to go two more miles to the Merrifield Bridge and he is going to get to his place fifteen or twenty minutes earlier that is the route he is going to take, so we are assuming what human behavior is going to be, which we don't know what that is going to be, but what he will tell you is coming to these MPO meetings and we talked about things coming up, even with the Mill and train traffic, people will take the safest route, and the safest route is to go that way and by-pass all those issues that are upcoming which are of concern that you guys have to deal with. He said that his last comment is going to be that if this does go forward and you guys vote to do that feasibility study, what, as citizens actions do they have, does this have to be authorized through the City Councils on both sides, or is whatever you guys say or decide to do happens, so you guys are empowered to go ahead and do this feasibility study because you were commissioned to do so or is this something that you have to get permission to move forward, that is an important question for him.

Audience member added that the vote today isn't to do this feasibility study, it is to consider doing a feasibility study, correct. Vetter responded that it is to direct staff to upgrade our work program and develop the RFP so we can look at it. Audience member asked if; 32nd is going to be a wet bridge, so now you have three bridges that are wet and you spent the money on that plus destroying the dike and greenway and everything else that has been there just to put a bridge in there, and the fact that traffic is

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

busy over here by the Point Bridge, so let's just push it over from one neighborhood to the other, it just doesn't make sense, again it's the why.

Audience member said that she has a question on the feasibility that will be done by August. She said that she understands the hydraulics and everything, so when that is done is the traffic pattern a part of the study or is it just the ground and the flood, is that put into this. Haugen responded that the traffic is a key component to it. Audience member asked how many months do you study the traffic pattern, will it be for a couple of months, for half a year, a year. Haugen responded that the traffic patterns will be today's traffic, then we look at what we are forecasting the traffic to be in 2030 based on both City's Land Use Plans, and what the traffic is forecasted to be in 2045, again based on both City's Land Use Plans. Audience member said then, that the current traffic that you are studying, her question is how long will that be studied, is it a month, two months, three months, for the actual traffic pattern. Haugen responded that as you heard earlier on the agenda we have a counting program operating 24/7 on the North Dakota side at major key intersections, so we have that counting program monitoring traffic continuously, so when we get to places that don't have signals like Belmont and 32nd we periodically sit at the intersection and count traffic so we have several dates that that has been done. Audience member asked if this was done this last year. She said that her concern is that these are done only in the summer and it won't reflect year round traffic patterns. She added that the second thing she is wondering is how the study that you did showing that the Merrifield Bridge would not be used as much and the 32nd and 47th would be utilized more; she goes back and forth with appointments to East Grand Forks, and she isn't a realtor but she is in the real estate market, and is very familiar with the land that is going very quickly in East Grand Forks, and there are developments going up and are some very nice homes, there are schools on the south end of East Grand Forks, so her question is, gosh they are right there, and she would like to see a real, maybe a drone put into action for a projected – Option A – here is how long it would take to go down to Merrifield because these new development that are in East Grand Forks are the people that would use a southend bridge, the people on the north aren't going to drive south, the people in the middle they are still going to use the bridges that are there, it is the people in the south that will be using these bridges, so she doesn't understand how that study states that a Merrifield Bridge doesn't have as much action, she would prefer, considering how much she goes back and forth to East Grand Forks daily, she thinks it would be faster, it would be straight down – forward – up, and going through stoplights, traffic, and children, she doesn't see how that study is so drastic on its numbers because there is major development in East Grand Forks, so she doesn't see how that is right.

Audience member asked, if we fund the study, there is the open question of whether the bridge will go there or not, if we don't fund the study this is going to be a continuing problem, or if we don't fund the study then does the 32nd Avenue lose its support and it goes away, they are trying to figure out what is the easiest way to get this thing off the table for good; so it is a crapshoot if you take the study and it says it works or if you take the study and it says that with the hydraulics and safety and stuff it won't work, but he thinks you have to decide one way or the other but their choice is to make it go away, and what is the best way to make it go away. DeMers responded that the problem with that is as long as there are traffic problems upstream, you're going to have this; whether you say we aren't going to do the feasibility study today, we are going to push it off, as long as you keep pushing this further south; he

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

keeps hearing we are going south, understood, they understand that when you look at the land use plans you can see where the traffic is going, but that doesn't eliminate the traffic that is already present. He added that we hear from Grand Forks Council Members, we see in the traffic demand models that the stuff that we have right now, and in the near future, if you don't do something to affect that you are always hear about it. He commented that the problem with the 47th Avenue location, and just going to Merrifield is that the distance that they would have to go to 47th still leaves a big enough gap that allows for those type of traffic problems to continue so, as he said, nobody here wants to keep doing this over and over again, they don't, but as long as we don't address the issues, it will keep coming up. He added that, as was mentioned, probably the fastest way is if you get there and you see hydraulic studies that say that corridor isn't going to allow you to do something, that would be a big problem, but then the problem just gets bigger and you end up having to build dry bridges; and still you are at Merrifield and then you build a high bridge at 32nd instead of a wet one and now the cost is \$60 million, that is the problem, this isn't driven by just one person's desire, we are seeing critical failures at intersections up to that point. Huot commented that it would be a better point, it is a lack of desire because we haven't done anything at Merrifield since 2004; our discussion should have been the Merrifield Bridge is not accommodating the traffic flow in town, it is completely backwards because we already did the feasibility, we already had it in 2004. DeMers responded, though, that we know that the Merrifield Bridge isn't going to alleviate the traffic issues. Audience members said that you don't know that, there is no way to know that. Huot said that he can't say that it will or won't, we don't know, but what we do know is that a study was done and that is a proposed site, and it just died, why did it die.

Audience member stated that we are two small cities, it's like you're talking about this big gap; well, what it is going to take us five extra minutes, think about living in the Cities, people drive an hour to get to work and back, so that doesn't make sense to her. She asked if anyone on the board lives in their neighborhood, you don't have to worry about it.

Vetter said that he would like to move this on, but he will stay after the meeting to visit with anyone that wants to visit, but he would like to move this on as there are people that need to get back to work, so we have a motion and a second on the floor.

MOVED BY VEIN, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE DRAFTING AN AMENDMENT TO THE 2020 WORK PROGRAM TO DELAY THE FOUR CURRENTLY PROGRAMMED STUDIES AS DISCUSSED AND TO INCLUDE A 32ND AVENUE SOUTH BRIDGE FEASIBILITY STUDY, AND TO DEVELOP THE RFP.

Voting Aye: Vetter, Powers, Mock, Grasser, DeMers, Rost, and Vein

Voting Nay: Strandell

Abstain: None

Absent: None

MATTER OF DISCUSSION ON FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION UPDATE

Haugen reported that this is just bring you up-to-date on what discussions have been taking place. He said that last month we were informed that we had to eliminate some of these stubs from classification

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

for the NDDOT, but we also, since we are doing an update, we also introduced some other discussion areas and they are still working and discussion them.

Haugen said that one of those discussion areas are that all of the frontage roads in Grand Forks are functionally classified, and whether or not we should still carry them as such is being discussed. He added that there are also areas through the downtown where we have very close spacing of functionally classified roadways and under the new guidance that we have from our federal partners, there is a question as to whether we should be maintaining such close spacing of classified roadways, so that is also being looked at and we are still working through the discussion process.

Haugen stated that last month we alluded that we might have a new schedule, an earlier one than our program has for completing this, which was the end of the year, but NDDOT has said that they are fine with that completion time.

Haugen commented that on the Minnesota side, since we had just done a statewide classification, there are really no identified areas in East Grand Forks or Polk County that need to be reclassify, so our focus will be in the North Dakota side for now.

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Kevin Kouba, Resident, commented that he thinks that what we just saw here was; well we all know where all of the audience members came from; and he thinks the biggest portion of the comments came from a lack of communication, a lack of understanding, so his question is, he knows that this body has said before that you put this information on your social media page, but is there a way that they can identify items specific to them on this issue, is there an e-mail that can go out or something. He said that this is like poking a bees nest, when they just hear about a meeting first or second hand that all this information is available, and now it is back in the forefront, but he thinks you see what happens when you drop something on a neighborhood, when no consultation is held with the people that are most affected by it, and he thinks the problem is is that we have to take a lot of the emotion out of this, and he doesn't think that is possible anymore with some of them, so if there is a way to keep them informed on the process of what is going on so they can look at it and be prepared to ask questions that have more relevance than just the emotional part of it he thinks that would serve everyone better, so his question is is there a way to do that. Haugen responded that staff has been informed that Jon Strandell is the conduit for the corridor. He said that initially it was through Mr. Huot, and now it is through Mr. Strandell, although Mr. Huot is still being informed as well, and of course the ward Alderman is informed as well.

Kouba asked if all of this is available on-line and you will let us know where it is at. Haugen responded that it is and gave the website address (www.theforksmpo.org).

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, June 19th, 2019**

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 5/18/19 to 6/14/19 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL TO APPROVE THE ATTACHED BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 5/19/19 TO 6/14/19 PERIOD, AS SUBMITTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

- c. Mn220No. Study Meeting

Haugen reported that there is a Mn220No. Study meeting scheduled for Tuesday, June 25th in the afternoon in this room and then a presentation will be given at the East Grand Forks City Council Work Session that evening.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE JUNE 19th, 2019, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 1:24 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy McNelis,
Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 May 18 through June 14, 2019

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-877.83
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,431.98
Liability Check	06/14/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,359.90
Alliant Engineering							
Bill	06/04/2019	Inv. #...	Work On Mn2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		566 · MN220 N...	-3,179.36
Bill Pmt -Check	06/04/2019	6754	Work On Mn2...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-3,179.36
Brady Martz							
Bill	06/11/2019	Inv. #...	Balance Due ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		515 · Financial...	-1,700.00
Bill Pmt -Check	06/11/2019	6756	Balance Due ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,700.00
Business Essentials							
Bill	06/06/2019	Inv. #...	Office Supplie...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-14.64
Bill Pmt -Check	06/06/2019	6755	Office Supplie...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-14.64
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	05/30/2019	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-2,058.15
Bill Pmt -Check	05/30/2019	6749	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,058.15
Earl Haugen							
Bill	06/12/2019		Reimburse Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-14.00
Bill Pmt -Check	06/12/2019	6757	Reimburse Fo...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-14.00
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	6744	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-16.88
Kadrmaz, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill	06/03/2019	Inv. #...	For Work On ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-15,543.24
Bill Pmt -Check	06/03/2019	6750	For Work On ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-15,543.24
Bill	06/03/2019	Inv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-2,262.70
Bill Pmt -Check	06/03/2019	6752	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,262.70
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	05/21/2019	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	05/21/2019	6742	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-147.87
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	6745		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-90.28
Mike's							
Bill	05/22/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-110.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/22/2019	6743	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-110.00
Bill	05/30/2019		MPO Meeting	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-28.00
Bill Pmt -Check	05/30/2019	6748	MPO Meeting	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-28.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-217.00
Liability Check	06/14/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-207.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	6746		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-117.78
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-640.92
Liability Check	06/14/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-640.92
NDPERS							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-5,780.25
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	05/29/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-8,423.34
Liability Check	06/12/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-8,299.25
SRF Consulting Group, Inc.							
Bill	06/03/2019	Inv. #...	Work On CAT...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-1,567.42
Bill Pmt -Check	06/03/2019	6751	Work On CAT...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,567.42
Bill	06/03/2019	Inv. #...	Work On CAT...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-5,944.17
Bill Pmt -Check	06/03/2019	6753	Work On CAT...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,944.17
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	05/31/2019	6747		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-158.60