

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
Wednesday, January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020, - 12:00 Noon  
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020, meeting of the MPO Executive Policy Board to order at 12:00 p.m.

**CALL OF ROLL**

On a Call of Roll the following members were present: Clarence Vetter, Mike Powers, Marc DeMers, Bob Rost, Warren Strandell, and Jeannie Mock.

Absent were: Al Grasser and Ken Vein.

Guests(s) present were: David Kuharenko, Grand Forks Engineering.

Staff present were: Earl Haugen, GF/EGF MPO Executive Director; 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 DECEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD**

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE DECEMBER 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF FY2020 T.I.P. AMENDMENT**

Haugen reported that this is a request from MnDOT to amend our T.I.P. He explained that the amendment is to shift the federal funding amount and award from FY2021 into FY2022, but the project itself will still be constructed in FY2021. He stated that this is a result of the State Fiscal Year starting July 1<sup>st</sup> and the Federal Fiscal Year starting October 1<sup>st</sup>, so they are just moving the Federal Fiscal Year funding into 2022 which is at the tail end of 2021. He added that the cost estimate, because even though there is a year of expenditure adjustment, it is still not being actually built until 2022 so the cost estimate is still valid.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15, 2020

Haugen commented that this is a project out at U.S.#2, and while most of it is outside of the MPOs study area, it does involve the intersection of U.S.#2 and U.S.Bus2.

Haugen reported that a couple of years ago we did an extensive study; worked with the property owners, the City and State to determine what type of improvement should be done at this intersection. He said that, originally, in their safety documents they wanted to have complete closure of U.S.Bus2, but this project is providing funding to do Alternative 3B from that report which will eliminate left turns out of U.S.Bus2 to go north. He said that they are proposing that the access to the Stable Business will provide the opportunity for those left turns to be made.

Haugen commented that a public hearing was held at the Technical Advisory Committee last Wednesday, and they did publish prior to it that we were seeking public comments, but no comments were received so MPO Staff and the Technical Advisory Committee are recommending approval of this T.I.P. amendment.

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE FY2020 T.I.P. AMENDMENT, AS PRESENTED.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Vein.***

**MATTER OF APPROVAL OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS FOR THE 2021-2024 T.I.P.**

Haugen reported that included in the packet were staff reports that talk about candidate projects; and he put together a presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) to try to condense all of the information given on these projects.

Haugen commented that the first few slides are just reviews on what we did and what we are supposed to be doing with our T.I.P. document; we are supposed to make sure that they are consistent with our planning documents, and also to prioritize them into the programs being committed. He referred to a map and pointed out the area in which projects that are falling within this area need to be included in our T.I.P. in order to be properly funded.

Haugen referred to the presentation and stated that it gives the basic definition of what three types of projects that should be included in the T.I.P. He stated that there is a twelve month process and there are still some unknowns; FAST-Act is still being implemented and it also expires at the end of June 2020 so reauthorization looms ahead as does funding, so what we do today is subject to change because of these unknowns.

Haugen stated that what he will present today are; if any project in the current T.I.P. are being changed, and then these four specific programs; on the Minnesota side programs, and then on the North Dakota side we have Urban, Urban Local and Urban Regional.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15, 2020

Haugen commented that this also shows that we completed some of this process already, and since December these are the programs that we've looked at. He added that the next program that we will be soliciting on the North Dakota side will be the Transit Capital Solicitation, which will be done in February and due in April.

Haugen said that in the current year T.I.P. there are no changes to the current year. He pointed out that we did just amend the T.I.P., that was the one change, but we had to do that in a separate action and there are no other changes being proposed.

a) Minnesota Side

Haugen stated that on the Minnesota side, Polk County did not submit any projects, and East Grand Forks projects is once every four years and they are programmed in 2022 already and the next cycle is 2026 and our Transportation Plan identifies work on the Point Bridge as the project slated for 2026.

Haugen commented that in the MnDOT Program they are requesting the consideration of replacing the two traffic signals in Downtown East Grand Forks on DeMers Avenue. He said that one is at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and the other is at 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and the total cost for both is \$1.12 million dollars, and there is no federal funding being identified so roughly \$900,000 will be State funds and \$300,000 will be from the City of East Grand Forks. He stated that MnDOT has indicated that they are looking for the Downtown Transportation Study to help refine these projects and to make sure that one of the things we really hope to get with that study is better coordination between the North Dakota side signals and the Minnesota side signals and this replacement is going to provide us with the best opportunity to make sure that the equipment is capable of doing that.

Vetter stated that on the street light project he was wondering if there was a typo because he thought they had \$300,000 per light and they were originally looking at three lights, and then they scaled it back to two lights so is it still \$900,000. Haugen responded that it is still \$900,000. He explained that even though they did drop one of the signals, because of the transportation study they may be adding some components to the signal cabin so they kept the original estimate.

***MOVED BY DEMERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE MINNESOTA SIDE CANDIDATE PROJECT FOR THE FY2021-2024 T.I.P., AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Vein.***

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15, 2020

b) North Dakota Side

(1) Urban Grant

Haugen reported that this program is officially known as the North Dakota Urban Grant Program, but most of you may be more familiar with the term “Main Street Initiative”, and this is one of the programs that is out of that Main Street Initiative. He explained that this was initiated about two years ago and is now officially an annually solicited program of the NDDOT and it focuses on new multi-modal choices in certain areas of North Dakota; for Grand Forks the primary area or focus area is highlighted in yellow, however officially projects outside this focus area can be submitted for consideration and Grand Forks has been awarded funds from this program for reconstruction of North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Haugen stated that there is one candidate project submitted by the City, it is for North 4<sup>th</sup> Street, between DeMers Avenue and 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, with a roughly \$2 million dollar cost estimate with \$1.6 million in federal funds and it is a streetscaping project that will incorporate bulb outs ornamental street lights, decorative sidewalks, and additional amenities.

DeMers asked what year this project is proposed to be scheduled in. Haugen responded that it is proposed for FY2022. DeMers said, though, that there is potential for construction at that location, is that being considered. Haugen asked if he was referring to the building remodel and construction at that location. DeMers responded that that is what he is referring to. Haugen suggested that Mr. Kuharenko might be able to address this better. Kuharenko stated that he believes that at that point in time they can shift it a little bit if they need to. He added that it would be for FY2022, which means that it could be constructed in either FY2022 or FY2023, and so he believes that that parking lot is anticipated to start construction in FY2021, so depending on where that schedule lines up they should be able to shift it a little bit as well as work around it. He said that there is still an alley access there as well that they could also operate from if needed. Haugen commented that that question was raised and this was the basic response, the person proposing the project is aware of this application.

Haugen stated that one thing that was noted is; they are doing the transportation study and one of the main purposes for doing it is to enhance and/or increase multi-modalism and this application didn't make any mention of bicycle facilities other than bike racks, so they are identifying that we hope that the outcome of the study could be incorporated if it does identify bicycle facilities or transit facilities beyond what the application has into the final project.

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE URBAN GRANT CANDIDATE PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Vein.***

(2) Urban Roads – Local Grant

Haugen reported that Urban Roads – Local are the streets that are on the functionally classified system that are city streets, or local streets. He said that again the City of Grand Forks is submitting the rehab of the Columbia Road Overpass. He stated that it was submitted last year, but it was not awarded funds, so the year of expenditure was adjusted to reflect FY2024 cost estimates. He said that the cost is just shy of \$8.5 million with a federal request of \$6.7. He stated that they did note, as they did last year, that if awarded this will cause our fiscally constrained plan to become unbalanced, so we will have to make some adjustments into the transportation plan itself if it is awarded at this amount.

Haugen commented that last year the City had a report prepared, it was in draft form, so he took a screen shot of a page from the report submitted indicating that it is now a final report and all of cost estimates are being derived from a final report to reflect where the application is.

Haugen said that both the Technical Advisory Committee and staff are requesting that the MPO Board find that this project is consistent with the MPO transportation plan.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY MOCK, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE URBAN ROADS LOCAL GRANT CANDIDATE PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Vein.***

(2) Urban Roads – Regional Grant

Haugen reported that the Urban Regional Roads are the State Highways within the City of Grand Forks.

Haugen stated that, as noted in the staff report, there are a couple of things. He stated that the first thing is that there were several scoping worksheets that were part of the official application to get into the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. and a couple of months ago we amended our T.I.P. to reconcile it with some decisions that the State of North Dakota DOT made with their S.T.I.P; and what they did was to move some projects around and also modified some of the federal amounts for certain projects and the City and the State finally submitted the scoping worksheets, which ideally would have come before amending our TIP action, but it's clean-up work; even those roads were submitted, they are already in the T.I.P. so he hasn't provided you any of that information. There really isn't anything for us to act on for those projects.

Haugen said that the City also submitted the 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Congestion Relief/NEPA document, and possible improvement; those are tracking on a separate process between the City and the State, but at some point in time we will be asked to take action on that but right now it is in a

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15, 2020

separate negotiation process, and we aren't currently a member of that process, so all of that information is not included in your packet today either.

Haugen said that the other thing that was noted is, and we did discuss this a couple of months ago, about North Dakota trying to get a better handle on cost escalation or scope creep in their Urban Program, and in their Regional Program in particular so they had revised their scoping worksheet forms to try to give better instructions and to ultimately get better cost estimates, so we notice that with the original forms submitted they weren't using the updated forms nor following the instructions as well as they should so we noted that, we had discussion at the Technical Advisory Committee about this issue and the City and the District have resubmitted those forms on the regional side and now are asking you to take action on the FY2024 project, but as part of the North Dakota process there is also kind of a heads up of what might be coming down in FY2025, and there are two projects for that as well.

Haugen commented that the one project that they are asking the Board to consider is reconstruction of South Washington Street, between Hammerling Avenue and 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue South. He stated that the cost estimate is \$5.7 million with \$4.56 in federal funds. He said that as the staff report indicates, there was an extensive corridor study done in 2012, and the estimate for this same area was \$10 million dollars inflated to today's dollars, so staff is trying to understand what all is entailed in the candidate project. He explained that the revised cost estimate went from just a lump sum from this document and then there are separate design engineering and construction engineering costs to get it to the \$5.7 right-of-way.

Haugen referred to slides showing the detail provided in the corridor report and the project map that was identified in the application and stated that in the application itself it does talk about the corridor study access management, some of those things that we are trying to reconcile is how much of the recommended multi-modal improvements are being included in this project so he included out of that report what all those were, and you can see a lot of access management; a couple of other key components were trying to include some bus pull-outs along the corridor, take the opportunity when there is a full reconstruction taking place to try to address some of these items. He added that we have some off-set align roadways, so the report did include a recommendation on how to realign those side streets; possible closure of 9<sup>th</sup> with bus pull-outs, and also include a pedestrian crossing there.

Haugen stated that, again, one of the things they are trying to ensure is that the cost estimate that we are asking the State to actually program reflects all of the things that we might want to be improving in this corridor when reconstruction is taking place, and so that is where we have discussion about a \$5.7 million dollar project versus a \$10 million dollar project. He said that right now the City and the District, after our Technical Advisory Committee meeting, are still holding on to the \$5.7 million dollar total project cost.

Haugen said that for the one year beyond, again we are just giving a heads up on these and aren't taking any formal action. He stated that there are two projects; one is a continuation of reconstructing South Washington Street, and between the Technical Advisory Committee discussion and the revised submittal of the cost estimate the cost dropped almost in half; and then

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD  
Wednesday, January 15, 2020

there is a project on Gateway Drive between Columbia Road and the Kennedy Bridge. He stated that, again they are trying to determine if this might be the opportune time to include some of the items that are in our Skewed Intersection Study that we are almost done with.

Haugen commented that with the South Washington Street Project, one of the things that we have to try to make sure is that the cost estimate that is being submitted is intended to be upheld throughout project development so if it isn't enough then all those other things that we are trying to add to the project more or less become us either stealing from other regional projects or using local funds. He said that MPO staff is asking the board to figure out which of the cost estimates you want to submit, and he thinks that the Technical Advisory Committee and staff aren't quite in agreement as to what amount should be submitted, but he thinks they have an amount that they would suggest other than what was in the application or what was in the corridor report.

Kuharenko stated that Grand Forks City staff did work with the NDDOT Local District staff to look at all three of these applications to go through to produce a more detailed cost estimate that the NDDOT in Bismarck is looking for and they ended up going through and doing that. He said that when the Local District staff reevaluated the cost estimates they ended up noticing that the second project on Washington didn't figure very high in the estimate so that was reduced, however they were still comfortable with the \$5.7 million for the Washington project for 2024. He added that in looking at the study the Local District staff worked on trying to determine what portions of it would be incorporated in the project that would happen under the environmental document and the preliminary engineering that is done on that project.

Vetter said, then, that you are looking for a motion to accept the project with either a \$5.7 million dollar price tag or a \$10 million dollar price tag. Haugen added that it could be something in between those two numbers as well.

Haugen reported that the big push this T.I.P. cycle was to get better cost estimates from the start, and what happens is if we are low and we go through the project development and NEPA process, and say that we are here and we are reconstructing and tearing everything out so let's fix this, that and the other thing; and now the cost estimate is more but NDDOT already fiscally the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. to the original cost estimate, so they have to take money from another project. He added that they have been running into problems in the past where projects have mushroomed in cost and there only is x amount of dollars available so that means someone else's project won't get done.

Vetter asked where the \$5.7 million dollar estimate came from. Kuharenko responded that it came from the NDDOT Local District staff.

Powers asked Mr. Kuharenko if they are comfortable with the \$5.7 million dollar cost estimate. Kuharenko responded that he thinks they are in agreement with the NDDOT Local District staff, with the \$5.7 million dollar estimate.

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE NORTH DAKOTA SIDE URBAN ROADS REGIONAL GRANT CANDIDATE PROJECT AS BEING CONSISTENT WITH THE MPO TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND TO GIVE IT PRIORITY RANKING.***

Mock asked what the benefit of going with the \$5.7 million dollar cost estimate versus the higher estimate, or what is the danger of going with the lower estimate. Haugen responded that the danger is that you are going to be capped at the \$5.7 million dollars; and the benefit of going higher is you can come up with a \$5.7 million dollar project and help all the other projects be releasing funds. He added that one of the risks you have in going with a higher amount is, again this is a Statewide competition and only one project from our MPO area that will be competing against other projects on the regional system throughout the State, so are you asking for too much money compared to other projects in the State, that is a balance. He said that it seems like at least the Local Government Division of the NDDOT is trying to make sure that, again, scope creep and cost escalation are minimized from this point forward in the T.I.P./S.T.I.P. cycle, and that is what we tried to convey to all partners a couple of months ago when solicitations went out, and we are continuing that conversation.

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

***Voting Nay: None.***

***Abstain: None.***

***Absent: Grasser and Vein.***

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

There was no one present for comment.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this is what we prepared for this month, even though it is labeled 2020 a lot of projects are still showing that they would be completed in 2019. He said that if you didn't notice the calendar this year it was awfully fast after the holidays so next month you will see a true 2020 reflection of the projects being done in 2020. He pointed out that the big things are the Skewed Intersection Study, and we are hoping to finalize that in February; and you did see the highest ranking alternative out of that and what stands between now and taking final action is a presentation to the Grand Forks Committee of the Whole and final word that North Dakota upper management has become familiar with the project so in February we hope to finalize it.

Haugen commented that the Downtown Transportation Study had a meeting with its Steering Committee in December, and he is sure you all have received e-mails about that. He said that there was a traffic operations report that was produced as part of that. He added that in February we will have our second Steering Committee meeting and will look at future traffic forecasts and then we will also schedule our public engagement activities for that study.

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 12/14/19 TO 1/10/20 Period

***MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY DEMERS, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 12/14/19 TO 1/10/20 PERIOD.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

- c. U.S. Build America Meeting – January 21, 2020 at 9:45 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.

Haugen reported that staff just wants to make everyone aware of the U.S. Build America Meeting on January 21<sup>st</sup> from 9:45 to around 11:30 a.m. He said that there will be a video conference set up at the Grand Forks NDDOT Local District office just north of Washington. He added that it would be appreciated if you would let the MPO know if you are planning on attending so that we can let them know how much space they will need to set up.

Strandell asked what the meeting is about. Haugen responded that the Build Program is one of the Federal Governments new way of trying to infuse more construction into primarily the rural areas of America. He stated that this meeting is focusing on the portion of the Build Program that is eligible for only rural areas of America so for us, if you look at the MPO Study Area Map, is the area in the lighter tan shaded areas. He added that across the rural areas of North Dakota and Minnesota other projects could receive funding from this program; the one that will be talked most about at this meeting is actually more of a loan program. He explained that most federal program are grants where you are reimbursed for cost and you don't have to replay them, but this would be a loan focused discussion to try to get more projects going in rural America, so it would be a combination of loan monies and federal monies, but the essence of this meeting is for the Federal Government/Trump Administration to try to promote more investment in rural America.

DeMers asked if this was only for classified corridors. Haugen responded that federal eligibility requirements still apply. He added that new construction or expansion are probably some of the bigger things that this program would be able to identify in the staff report, and the biggest project we've ever identified that might be able to be discussed with this program would be the Merrifield Bridge. He added that even though this is a North Dakota Presentation, those from Minnesota are welcome to attend if they are interested.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

***MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY STRANDELL, TO ADJOURN THE JANUARY 15<sup>TH</sup>, 2020, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:34 P.M.***

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.***

Respectfully Submitted,  
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO**  
**Transaction List by Vendor**  
 December 14, 2019 through January 10, 2020

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
<b>AFLAC.</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-482.50
<b>Alerus Financial</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,540.48
Liability Check	01/10/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,539.16
<b>AMPO</b>							
Bill	12/18/2019	Inv. #...	AMPO Memb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-367.62
Bill Pmt -Check	12/18/2019	6856	AMPO Memb...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-367.62
<b>Business Essentials</b>							
Bill	12/17/2019	Inv. #...	Tripp Lite HD...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-46.26
Bill Pmt -Check	12/17/2019	6854	Tripp Lite HD...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-46.26
<b>CitiBusiness Card</b>							
Bill	01/02/2020	Acct. ...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-303.53
Bill Pmt -Check	01/02/2020	6865	Charges For ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-303.53
<b>Fidelity Security Life.</b>							
Liability Check	12/23/2019	6860	50790-1043	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-8.39
<b>Intrado Interactive Services Corporation</b>							
Bill	12/20/2019	Inv. #...	Website Acce...	206 · Accounts Pay...		525 · Citizens ...	-2,510.00
Bill Pmt -Check	12/20/2019	6864	Website Acce...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-2,510.00
<b>Kadrmass, Lee &amp; Jackson, Inc.</b>							
Bill	12/17/2019	Inv. #...	Work On GF ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-2,522.64
Bill Pmt -Check	12/17/2019	6855	Work On GF ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,522.64
Bill	01/02/2020	Inv. #...	Retainage Fo...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-5,990.94
Bill Pmt -Check	01/02/2020	6866	Retainage Fo...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-5,990.94
<b>Liberty Business Systems, Inc.</b>							
Bill	12/18/2019	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	12/18/2019	6857	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-147.87
<b>LSNB as Trustee for PEHP</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
<b>Madison Nat'l Life</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	6861		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-50.78
<b>Mike's</b>							
Bill	12/18/2019		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-110.84
Bill Pmt -Check	12/18/2019	6859	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-110.84
<b>Minnesota Department of Revenue</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-192.00
Liability Check	01/10/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-190.00
<b>Minnesota Life Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	6862		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-109.02
<b>Nationwide Retirement Solutions</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-390.92
Liability Check	01/10/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
<b>NDPERS</b>							
Liability Check	12/20/2019	NDPE...		104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
Liability Check	12/27/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,532.36
Liability Check	12/27/2019	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,010.18
<b>QuickBooks Payroll Service</b>							
Liability Check	12/26/2019		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,394.63
Liability Check	01/08/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,384.12
<b>SRF Consulting Group, Inc.</b>							
Bill	12/18/2019	Inv. #...	Work On UN...	206 · Accounts Pay...		565 · Special ...	-2,526.41
Bill Pmt -Check	12/18/2019	6858	Work On UN...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-2,526.41
<b>Standard Insurance Company</b>							
Liability Check	12/27/2019	6863		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
<b>Vaaler Insurance, Inc.</b>							
Bill	01/02/2020	Inv. #...	Insurance Re...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-1,360.41
Bill Pmt -Check	01/02/2020	6867	Insurance Re...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-1,360.41