

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
OF THE GRAND FORKS/EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
Wednesday, February 19th, 2020, - 12:00 Noon
East Grand Forks City Hall Training Room**

CALL TO ORDER

Clarence Vetter, Chairman, called the February 19th, 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 and Stephanie Halford, Grand Forks Planning.

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 JANUARY 15TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 15TH, 2019, MINUTES OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD, AS PRESENTED.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MATTER OF APPROVAL OF U.S.#2/U.S.81 SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY

Kouba reported that staff is seeking final approval of the study itself. She explained that when the study was presented to the Grand Forks Committee of the Whole, the Grand Forks Engineering Staff did bring forward some things that were of concern to them with the top thing being that BNSF didn't approve or show any support of any of the alternatives in the study, but it is simply their policy of not doing much if anything until there is a final design on the table that they can review and give input on. She added that there was a concern about pricing as well.

Kouba referred to a slide presentation (a copy of which is included in the file and available upon request) and explained that it is an updated version of what was presented to the Committee of the Whole.

Kouba stated that you did okay all the numbers, including some of those construction and design costs that engineering wanted to see, that aren't generally part of a planning and study document, but since Grand Forks Engineering wished to see them we did provide a high level estimate of those costs as well.

Kouba commented that the final concern was the cost of any necessary property acquisition. She stated that while they can get an idea of what this might entail, we can't get into explicit detail of which properties could, might, or would be desired to acquire for this project in this study, as that is part of the design part of the project, so we answered as much as we can in this study at this time. She said that they did bring this information forward to the public meetings and have allowed the engineers to go forward with the best alternatives to the public as they are going through their process of design and construction.

***MOVED BY MOCK, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO APPROVE THE U.S.#2/U.S.81
SKEWED INTERSECTION STUDY, AS PRESENTED.***

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser and Vein.

**MATTER OF PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO TRANSIT
DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Kouba reported that this is kind of a reactionary need to update our Transit Development Plan due to some changes that have occurred with Cities Area Transit; including adding some information about the UND Shuttle Service that we just completed a study on and the fact that it is being assumed by Cities Area Transit. She added that there were also some updates made to the financial section and we added input on the need to purchase three buses by Cities Area Transit for the UND Shuttle Service.

Kouba stated that the updates that were made to the financial section included the additional operation costs of taking on the UND Shuttle Service, and other cost changes for both Grand Forks and East Grand Forks as well.

Kouba said that they also made a few updates on the Capital side; which in Grand Forks was mostly making changes to the Illustrative Project list as most of the projects have now been programmed; and in East Grand Forks there were a couple of changes to the purchase of a some vehicles as MnDOT is not funding them now, however they are in our T.I.P. since our T.I.P. is beyond this Transit Development Plan, so we will be doing a full update on this next year.

Kouba commented that staff is requesting preliminary approval of this amendment and then we can move it forward to both Cities to see what they want to do with this, if they want to adopt the amendment or if they don't feel it meets their standards for a full document ???

MOVED BY ROST, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO GRANT PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF AMENDMENT TO TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AS PRESENTED.

Rost asked if this would be presented to both City Councils next. Kouba responded that it will be presented to both City Planning Departments for their review, after which they will let us know if it follows an amendment process, and if it doesn't then they will need to give us a letter stating that it doesn't, and then we will approve it through our approval process.

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

Voting Nay: None.

Abstain: None.

Absent: Grasser and Vein.

MATTER OF DRAFT T.I.P. PROCEDURAL MANUAL

a. MPO Draft Manual

Haugen reported that this is coming from the update of our Public Participation Plan. He explained that previously our Public Participation Plan had sections developed for a T.I.P. approval process, and we've had this T.I.P. Procedural Manual in place since 2010, so in the Draft Public Participation Plan that you adopted you minimized a lot of the steps in that document, talking about how T.I.P.s are handled, and instead refer people to this document and so this document needed to be updated regardless of what we did in the PPP, but it is important in that we reference this now in our Public Participation Planning document.

Haugen said that if you look through this document you will notice that there is a lot of reference to the Code of Federal Regulations. He explained that the T.I.P. is regulated to a large degree as to what it needs to have included in it; for the most part the document is reflecting what is currently in the code, but the big addition that has happened is Section 10 of the document which deals with performance planning and programming. He said that obviously our previous manual did not have this because it wasn't a requirement before, and this Section 10 is really taking the guidance we receive when we started to implement performance measures into our T.I.P., that we received from Federal Highway in Minnesota. He stated that this is the most significant addition to the manual.

Haugen commented that some of the other more significant revisions to the document are on the Tables of Programs that are available. He pointed out that on the North Dakota side they have updated to reflect what the current names of programs are, and there wasn't much change on the North Dakota side, but the one new one is the Urban Grant Program or the Main Street Initiative, and we have been dealing with that one already so we are somewhat familiar with it.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 19, 2020

Haugen said that on the Minnesota side there are a lot of question marks and holes still in the process of being figured out. He stated that they are still working with MnDOT on identifying how exactly we, as an MPO, are informed of what the dollars available are on an annual basis and also what process solicitation goes through, selection, prioritization, etc.

Haugen commented that the one thing that he did want to show; we do have a column still existing on the Minnesota side that shows how the revenue or funding is estimated at the start of each TIP cycle, you will not see that column on the North Dakota side because that is well documented and well vetted through when working the process, but for all the funds on the Minnesota side it isn't so well known and that is why there are all the question marks. He added that we also, on the North Dakota side, already consolidated what happens after the T.I.P. is produced when we have to make amendments or revisions and the language here should be pretty much the same as we took it out of the North Dakota side. He said that to show you what was there they just struck through the line but they are recommending that we actually take it out because it should read very much the same throughout the document.

Haugen said that the only other things that we are getting into are that we have projects that are federally funded and we have projects that are locally funded that are regionally significant, shown on Page 11 where we talk about Type 1 and Type 2 Projects, and Type 2 Projects are projects that are really there for informational purposes, informing our State and Federal Partners what new roadways or revisions to existing Federal Aid Systems are happening that aren't funded with federal funds. He pointed out the section where it says that this is the information that we need to have, and it is really geared towards those federal projects, and all the requirements on the federal side. He said that the City's and local jurisdictions are asking, well if it is a locally funded one do they always have to give this information each year on the projects, and we are trying to work through what information would be required; and he thinks there is an opportunity to get some things taken off this list, but not too much because it is basic information that they already have and they are choosing to share with us. He added that the concern is that, whereas our projects probably don't move much, on a local level, as development swings from year to year or couple of years to a couple of years the project list swings so we are trying to minimize how much paperwork shuffle is done between the agencies.

Haugen stated that the only other thing is is that we had to add in language that we are a bi-state MPO, there are times where we have to adopt a one side only T.I.P., so we just had to make that clear so the document now states this. He said that we also wanted to identify that the timelines that you see on this document are driven by the North Dakota process, we had to make note that Minnesota is usually a month or two behind on their T.I.P./S.T.I.P. processing.

Haugen said that they are just bringing everyone up to date on where we are at on this, that we do have a separate T.I.P. process manual, and it is still a work in progress but we are getting close and are filling in some of the cells on the Minnesota side in particular, and we have gotten great comments from both States, Federal and Local Partners.

b. MN Side T.I.P./S.T.I.P. Review

Haugen commented the one thing to also make you aware of; as part of the Federal Approval of the Minnesota Statewide Transportation Improvement Program last year, Federal Highway and Federal Transit are noticing that there are some procedural issues between the MPOs and the State, and so they made a finding on their approval and so this next several months Federal Highway and MnDOT are going to be working with the MPOs to smooth out some of these discrepancies from what the federal regulations indicate should be happening and what practice is happening and come to a new agreement. He said that they aren't sure what that outcome is, some of those cells in particular that are left empty, might be filling in differently by the end of this year, but they wanted to let everyone know that we feel that you should still approve this procedural manual, hopefully next month or April, and not wait for the outcome of this federal review process. He added that he thinks it is a good sign that we do have our feds kind of stepping in and hopefully making some processes more engaging for the MPO Board and it's local influence on project prioritization, etc.

MATTER OF 2020 FLOOD FORECAST AND COORDINATION

Haugen reported that this was before the Technical Advisory Committee last week. He said that the flood outlook is on the news, so he is sure everyone is aware that there could be a significant event this year. He explained that the MPO's primary purpose of having this item on the agenda is to make sure that the phone list is up to date. He said that last year we did significant revisions to this list, and so far we have not been aware of any need to make changes to the list, but if anyone knows of any changes that should be made to the list please let him know.

Haugen referred to the packet and pointed out that there is some new information included from the Weather Bureau, and he likes it because it gives you some sense of where the probability forecasts are in relationship to major events that have happened in the past.

Haugen stated that it seems likely that at 50% probability flood height obviously both the Point and the Sorlie are closed, but the Murray Bridge is likely to be closed as well so the people in the Point will have to take the long way around. He commented that what is unique about this is that the schools on the Point are community wide schools, and the schools on the north side are also community wide schools so there aren't any neighborhood schools that people can still go to if they have to, so they will still have to shift students back and forth, depending on which grade students are in.

Haugen said that the US 2/MN220 S. Intersection needs to have totally different traffic control at it, so that is kind of something that should have more attention given to than it was given during previous floods because we don't usually get this type of water level and closure at the Murry Bridge, so as you go back into your individual jurisdictions and talk about the flood fight, that might be something to bring up; they are already aware of it, but it is atypical this time around than it has been the last several years and we want to make sure that it isn't being lost in the response to the flood.

DeMers asked what happens with transit when those bridges are closed. Haugen responded that when the two bridges are closed transit does send a linking bus between the two downtowns via the Kennedy Bridge. He said that when the Point is closed Cities Area Transit, in the past, does not run that long way around to service the Point area, but he will check to make sure that is still the case.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON DOWNTOWN TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Haugen reported that this is just to make you aware that we are progressing on the Downtown Transportation Study.

Haugen commented that back in December they had the first meeting with the Steering Committee and Staff and presented the existing conditions, which is part of the packet today.

Haugen said that they are focusing on all four modes of transportation, yet it seems like the predominant discussion at the Steering Committee level is about parking.

Haugen stated that they met again as a Steering Committee on Valentine's Day, and again parking was still near and dear to their heart, but for the other modes there are some analyses that are done and when you look at the analysis, particularly when you get into level of service analysis, the way that the methodology works is that individually each intersection is acceptable from a letter grade point of view; as links they are acceptable, and if the modes are looked at from a level of service they also have an acceptable level of service, some are lower down on the grade level than perhaps you would like your child in elementary to have as a grade, but from an individual point of view the system grades out well, it is when it is collectively looked at that it starts to have issues, and for the obvious person, perhaps, the fact that we have the signal systems connected so close together, that is what really impedes progress through the downtown systems, and we also have a varying variability between months, and even days of the week, so when we average those things out in the methodology the average doesn't make it sound bad but on certain days of the week and certain months of the year we have more traffic there and then it really degrades down fast.

Haugen referred to a slide and pointed out that you can see the signal spacing and how it causes additional time to go through the intersections. He added that you can also see on the slide the free flow speed if you were the only vehicle on DeMers Avenue, traveling from end to end, but if you are going through there during the A.M. Peak you have to add 35% more time to your trip just because of the friction that is around you with the additional vehicles and the signal timing. He said that during the P.M. Peak you have to add 46%, and you will also notice that we show differences depending on which side of the river you are on, there is more traffic on the North Dakota side, and more signals, so you have more friction than on the Minnesota side, yet when you average everything out, it is fairly consistently that way, or when you think of it in reliability terms you know that you have to take extra time during those peak hours.

DeMers referred to the Vehicular Level of Service slide, and pointed out that it says that all intersections operate at a LOS C or better, but at 10th and DeMers Intersection in East Grand

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 19, 2020

Forks it shows it operates at a LOS D. Haugen responded that a LOS D is still acceptable. DeMers said that he is just curious because it shows that all of DeMers is a LOS C so he doesn't see why that intersection would be a LOS D and not a LOS C. He added that he is just wondering how they calculate the LOS for the actual lanes, because even looking at the 3rd Street N.W. Intersection heading south, that is at a LOS D as well, so is it a signal issue, or what is causing that difference. Haugen responded that in the report itself they do differentiate between the intersections, and then they have a separate analysis about the links, so that is what you are asking about, the links, so he will follow up on that.

Haugen commented that, just to explain Transit a little bit, it shows a lot of red on the Transit LOS, and the methodology that is in the National Reports uses how frequent the bus goes in front of that block face, so downtown we have routes that come to the transfer center and move out, but we don't have buses that run in front of all blocks, so the red is showing here because it is saying that a bus is not going in front of that block face but in reality a block away a bus is available, so the LOS, as far as Transit, is a little misleading.

Haugen said that he does want to cover crashes. He stated that they are using the latest crash data available to us. He pointed out that rear end crashes are the highest type of crashes, and if you look at the white dots you will see that a lot of those rear end crashes are occurring on DeMers Avenue, and a high number of those are occurring on the bridge itself, which is a little unusual as you would expect that vehicles wouldn't be stopping on the bridge, but again, because of the signal system we have traffic that is building up behind the 3rd Street signal on the Grand Forks Side or the 2nd Street on the East Grand Forks side, plus there is a curvature of the bridge so sometimes you don't see clearly what is just on the other side of the curve, so that is a crash issue that we are trying to focus in on.

Haugen stated that we also see an unusual amount of crashes on 3rd Street, and a lot of them involve parked vehicles. He said that we anticipate that we would have a lot of crashes in the downtown setting on a roadway that normally has significant width, but we are thinking that diagonal parking might have an influence there and so we are looking at how the crash pertains to diagonal parking.

Haugen commented that just because of sheer volume, the Intersection of 5th Street North in Grand Forks, and DeMers, we do have a high number of rear end crashes and a lot of them are due to the speed coming off of the overpass bridge and hitting the signal, and traffic built up behind the signal.

Haugen stated that we also have a couple of unique areas off the main part of downtown; on 6th Street or a block west of 5th Street, where most traffic is; a couple of intersections where we have a critical crash rate that is higher than what you would expect at a similar intersection anywhere else in either State, so we are looking at what might need to be improved at these intersections.

Haugen said that in East Grand Forks, 4th Street N.W., we do have a big category called "other" that is happening here so we have to look into those crash records a little bit more to find out individually if there is something that we can highlight as a predominant type of crash.

Haugen reported that, as he mentioned, the Steering Committee did meet on Valentines Day, and that information, on our Future Conditions Report, is available on-line if you want to view it. He said that, just to give everyone a quick highlight, the issues that we talked about today are only forecasted to not only not get better but to get worse in the future, however we are still not showing really a LOS F anywhere, other than our Transit LOS, which is misleading; but we do show that we are starting to get areas where we do have LOS E, so we will have to try to come up with some strategies and recommendations to maybe address some of those areas, operation wise.

Haugen commented that about Mid-March we will have our first public engagement activities taking place, where we will solicit peoples' input, what they perceive as the issues to address in the Downtown Transportation System.

MATTER OF UPDATE ON FUTURE BRIDGE HYDRAULIC STUDY

Haugen reported that this is just to bring everyone up-to-date on where most of these are at. He stated that last night the Grand Forks City Council approved to authorize the execution of a contract with KLJ as the prime consultant and A32S as the sub-consultant to do the hydraulic study.

Haugen reminded everyone that back in December we highlighted the basic information being looked at; three bridge heights at three locations, with the total cost being around \$95,000 and East Grand Forks will be paying half the cost of doing Elks and 32nd, so their costs will be around \$31,000 and the remaining \$47,000 being paid entirely by Grand Forks.

Haugen said that in the contract scope of work it looks like a draft report will be available around April, and a final in June.

Haugen commented that our work program is geared, based on this hydraulic study, and assuming that there is at least one sight to move forward on; so we have, then, in our work program to look at the traffic operations, and for both communities address the issues that are present that a bridge would bring, and try to come up with a strategy on how to mitigate that and move the potential bridge forward.

Mock asked who was on the Selection Committee. Haugen responded that the two City Council Presidents, the East Grand Forks Public Works Director, and the Grand Forks Assistant City Engineer, Mark Walker. He stated that they received five proposals.

OTHER BUSINESS

a. 2020 Annual Work Program Project Update

Haugen reported that this reflects where we are at with our work activities that are still progressing to final. He said that it also includes the Land Use Plan, and the Future Bridge will be added in as well.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
GF/EGF MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD
Wednesday, February 19, 2020

Haugen stated that the only other thing to highlight is that, yesterday at noon the public comment period ended for our Public Participation Plan Family. He said that the only significant comment we received was from MnDOT and will require a little bit of discussion between the two State DOTs, but MnDOT's comment is that even though North Dakota is the Lead Agency, and we have geared a lot of our procedures based off of North Dakota, they want to reflect that we also receive funds from Minnesota and there are some Minnesota Statutes that they want to make sure that we are made aware of. He stated that the statutes they are referencing regard open records, and what records we need to keep. He said that this will require a little bit of discussion between the two states.

DeMers asked how much of a difference is there between the two. Haugen responded that some things can be classified as confidential or kept away from the public, and North Dakota has a little more constraint on this, there are some things that Minnesota believes is releasable, but North Dakota may not, and vice versa, it depends on what type of data we have. DeMers stated that his preference would be to default to being more open. He said that he doesn't know if we get to pick and choose, is it data that is in the North Dakota realm? And the data that is in the Minnesota realm has to be whatever, or is it? Haugen responded that they are trying to avoid having two separate sort of standards that we have to decide if this data is subject to Minnesota or is it subject to North Dakota, we are trying to say that North Dakota is our Lead Agency, everything else, for the most part would default to North Dakota as the State of Rule, if you will, so that is why they are trying to have discussions at the State level with this, saying you either keep two things separate or only one organization, led by North Dakota.

- b. Approval Of Bill/Check List For 1/11/20 TO 2/14/20 Period

MOVED BY POWERS, SECONDED BY ROST, TO APPROVE THE BILL/CHECK LIST FOR THE 1/11/20 TO 2/12/20 PERIOD.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ADJOURNMENT

MOVED BY STRANDELL, SECONDED BY POWERS, TO ADJOURN THE FEBRUARY 19TH, 2020, MEETING OF THE MPO EXECUTIVE POLICY BOARD AT 12:44 P.M.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peggy McNelis, Office Manager

Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
 January 11 through February 14, 2020

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
AFLAC.							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	AFLAC	501	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-482.50
Alerus Financial							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-2,541.40
Liability Check	02/07/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-2,546.58
Liability Check	02/14/2020	EFTPS	45-0388273	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-1,445.94
Brady Martz							
Bill	01/30/2020	Inv. #...	Progress Billi...	206 · Accounts Pay...		515 · Financial...	-4,500.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/30/2020	6881	Progress Billi...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-4,500.00
Business Essentials							
Bill	01/27/2020	Inv. #...	Banker Boxes	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-74.09
Bill Pmt -Check	01/27/2020	6879	Banker Boxes	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-74.09
Bill	01/30/2020	Inv. #...	Legal and Jun...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-40.42
Bill Pmt -Check	01/30/2020	6882	Legal and Jun...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-40.42
Bill	02/04/2020	Inv. #...	Banker Boxes	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-74.09
Bill Pmt -Check	02/04/2020	6842	Banker Boxes	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-74.09
CitiBusiness Card							
Bill	01/24/2020	Acct #...	Charges For ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-48.24
Bill Pmt -Check	01/24/2020	6876	Charges For ...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-48.24
Docu Shred, Inc.							
Bill	02/12/2020	Inv. #...	Drop Off and ...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-49.23
Bill Pmt -Check	02/12/2020	6848	Drop Off and ...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-49.23
Earl Haugen							
Bill	02/06/2020		Travel Reimb...	206 · Accounts Pay...		530 · Educatio...	-13.80
Bill Pmt -Check	02/06/2020	6844	Travel Reimb...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-13.80
East Grand Forks Water and Light							
Bill	01/24/2020	Inv. #...	4th Quarter 2...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-482.10
Bill Pmt -Check	01/24/2020	6877	4th Quarter 2...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-482.10
Fidelity Security Life.							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	6874	50790-1043	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-8.44
Forum Communications Company							
Bill	02/11/2020	Inv. #...	Public Notice...	206 · Accounts Pay...		-SPLIT-	-380.50
Bill Pmt -Check	02/11/2020	6846	Public Notice...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-380.50
Hannaher's							
Bill	02/05/2020	Inv. #...	Install and Re...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-640.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/05/2020	6843	Install and Re...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-640.00
Kadrmaz, Lee & Jackson, Inc.							
Bill	01/15/2020	Inv. #...	Work on US#...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-42.72
Bill Pmt -Check	01/15/2020	6872	Work on US#...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-42.72
Bill	01/15/2020	Inv. #...	Work On Ske...	206 · Accounts Pay...		220 · Retainag...	-5,973.24
Bill Pmt -Check	01/15/2020	6873	Retainage Du...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-5,973.24
Bill	02/10/2020	Inv. #...	For Work Don...	206 · Accounts Pay...		550 · Corridor ...	-9,377.61
Bill Pmt -Check	02/10/2020	6845	For Work Don...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-9,377.61
Liberty Business Systems, Inc.							
Bill	01/24/2020	Inv. #...	Contract Bas...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-147.87
Bill Pmt -Check	01/24/2020	6878	Contract Bas...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-147.87
LSNB as Trustee for PEHP							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	PEHP		104 · Checking	X	216 · Post-Hea...	-123.75
Madison Nat'l Life							
Liability Check	01/30/2020	6883		104 · Checking		215 · Disability...	-66.85
Mike's							
Bill	01/15/2020		MPO Lunche...	206 · Accounts Pay...		711 · Miscellan...	-90.00
Bill Pmt -Check	01/15/2020	6871	MPO Lunche...	104 · Checking	X	206 · Accounts...	-90.00
Minnesota Department of Revenue							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-190.00
Liability Check	02/07/2020	MNDOR	1403100	104 · Checking		210 · Payroll Li...	-191.00
Minnesota Life Insurance Company							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	6875		104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-111.72
Nationwide Retirement Solutions							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-433.07
Liability Check	02/07/2020	NWR...	3413	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-433.07
NDPERS							
Liability Check	01/24/2020	NDPE...	D88	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-3,024.08
QuickBooks Payroll Service							
Liability Check	01/22/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking	X	-SPLIT-	-6,390.78
Liability Check	02/06/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-6,406.89
Liability Check	02/13/2020		Created by P...	104 · Checking		-SPLIT-	-3,849.91

**Grand Forks East Grand Forks MPO
Transaction List by Vendor
January 11 through February 14, 2020**

Type	Date	Num	Memo	Account	Clr	Split	Amount
Standard Insurance Company							
Liability Check	01/29/2020	6880		104 · Checking		217 · Dental P...	-118.88
State Tax Commissioner							
Liability Check	01/14/2020	NDST...	45038827301	104 · Checking	X	210 · Payroll Li...	-772.00
WSI							
Bill	02/11/2020	Inv. #...	Workforce Sa...	206 · Accounts Pay...		517 · Overhead	-250.00
Bill Pmt -Check	02/11/2020	6847	Workforce Sa...	104 · Checking		206 · Accounts...	-250.00