

## 518th Transportation Technical Committee Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments THURSDAY, May 2021 – 10:00 a.m.

### AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Introductions
2. Approve the Agenda Action Item
3. Consider Minutes of the April 8, 2021 TTC Meeting Action Item
4. Public Input Opportunity Public Input
5. FM Metro Bike/Ped Plan Update Consultant Selection Action Item
6. Moorhead 17<sup>th</sup> Street N Corridor Study Final Report Action Item
7. 2021 Household and Employment Data Purchase Action Item
8. Draft 2022 UPWP Budget Action Item
9. COVID-19 Analysis and Monitoring Report Information Item
10. FM Metro Area-Wide Traffic Count Project Update Information Item
11. Agency Updates Discussion Item
  - a. City of Fargo
  - b. City of Moorhead
  - c. City of West Fargo
  - d. City of Dilworth
  - e. City of Horace
  - f. Cass County
  - g. Clay County
  - h. Other Member Jurisdictions
12. Additional Business Information Item
13. Adjourn

REMINDER: The next TTC meeting will be held **Thursday, June 10, 2021** at 10:00 a.m.

Due to ongoing public health concerns related to COVID-19, Metro COG is encouraging citizens to provide their comments for consent agenda and regular agenda items on the April 8 agenda via email to [leach@fmmetrocog.org](mailto:leach@fmmetrocog.org). To ensure your comments are received prior to the meeting, please submit them by 8:00 a.m. on the day of the meeting and reference which agenda item your comments address. If you would like to appear via video or audio link for comments or questions on a regular agenda or public hearing item, please provide your e-mail address and contact information to the above e-mail at least one business day before the meeting.

**For Public Participation, please REGISTER with the following link:**  
[https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_hes4ykMWRZKy0tIUJq-ipA](https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_hes4ykMWRZKy0tIUJq-ipA)

Red Action Items require roll call votes.

**NOTE: Full Agenda packets can be found on the Metro COG Web Site at <http://www.fmmetrocog.org> – Committees**

Metro COG is committed to ensuring all individuals, regardless of race, color, sex, age, national origin, disability/handicap, sexual orientation, and/or income status have access to Metro COG's programs and services. Meeting facilities will be accessible to mobility impaired individuals. Metro COG will make a good faith effort to accommodate requests for translation services for meeting proceedings and related materials. Please contact Savanna Leach, Metro COG Executive Assistant, at 701-532-5100 at least five days in advance of the meeting if any special accommodations are required for any member of the public to be able to participate in the meeting.

**517th Meeting of the  
FM Metro COG Transportation Technical Committee  
Thursday, April 8, 2021 – 10:00 am  
Metro COG Conference Room**

**Members Present:**

Jonathan	Atkins	City of Moorhead Traffic Engineering
Julie	Bommelman	City of Fargo, MATBUS
Jeremy	Gorden	City of Fargo Transportation Engineering
Cindy	Gray	Metro COG
Robin	Huston	City of Moorhead Planning
Matthew	Jacobson	Clay County Planning
Kim	Lipetsky	Fargo Cass Public Health
Peyton	Mastera	City of Dilworth Administration
Grace	Puppe	Cass County Planning
Joe	Raso	GFMEDC
Mary	Safgren	MnDOT – District 4
Russ	Sahr	City of Horace Planning
Tim	Solberg	City of West Fargo Planning
Justin	Sorum	Clay County Engineering
Tom	Soucy	Cass County Highway (Alternate for Jason Benson)
Brit	Stevens	NDSU – Transportation Manager
Lori	Van Beek	City of Moorhead, MATBUS
Mark	Wolter	Freight Representative, Midnite Express
Andrew	Wrucke	City of West Fargo Engineering
Wayne	Zacher	NDDOT – Local Government Division

**Members Absent:**

Jason	Benson	Cass County Highway Engineering (alternate present)
Jaclynn	Maahs	Concordia College
Aaron	Nelson	Fargo City Planning

**Others Present:**

Adam	Altenburg	Metro COG
Angie	Bolstad	Stantec
Luke	Champa	Metro COG
Ari	Del Rosario	Metro COG
Dan	Farnsworth	Metro COG
Wade	Frank	Stantec
Matthew	Huettl	HDR
Brian	King	HDR
Savanna	Leach	Metro COG
Michael	Maddox	Metro COG
Diomo	Motuba	NDSU/ATAC
Anna	Pierce	MnDOT
Jordan	Smith	MATBUS
Kristen	Sperry	FHWA - ND
Steve	Strack	Houston Engineering
Kyle	Weiler	HDR

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am, on April 8, 2021 by Chair Gray. A quorum was present.

**2. Approve the 517 TTC Meeting Agenda**

Chair Gray asked if there were any questions or changes to the 517 TTC Meeting Agenda.

***Motion: Approve the 517 TTC Meeting Agenda.  
Mr. Atkins moved, seconded by Mr. Mastera  
MOTION, PASSED.  
Motion carried unanimously.***

**3. APPROVE March 11, 2021 TTC MEETING MINUTES**

Chair Gray asked if there were any questions or changes to the March 11, 2021 TTC Meeting Minutes.

***Motion: Approve the March 11, 2021 TTC Minutes.  
Ms. Bommel moved, seconded by Mr. Sahr  
MOTION, PASSED  
Motion carried unanimously.***

**4. Public Comment Opportunity**

No public comments were made or received.

**5. Interstate Operations Analysis Consultant Selection**

Ms. Gray said that the work leading up to the release of the RFP and the selection of a consultant team for this project has been a large undertaking. She thanked the selection committee for their time and effort and NDSU/ATAC for their guidance on this project. Six consultant proposed on this project, and the highest ranked firm and recommendation of the selection committee was HDR. The estimated project cost came in at \$399,417.63.

***Motion:  
Mr. Gorden moved, seconded by Mr. Atkins  
MOTION, PASSED  
Motion carried unanimously.***

**6. Job and Household Data Request for Proposals Update**

Mr. Maddox said that this data is purchased every five years. The last data purchase in 2016 from InfoGroup was found to be incomplete for the needs of the agency. For this purchase, NDSU/ATAC will be used as a resource to develop the necessary specifications for solicitation of vendors. Mr. Motuba explained the two separate data sets of job data and household data and how the data sets will be utilized by the agency. Metro COG hopes to finalize a vendor by May of 2021. Ms. Van Beek said that the ReMix (transit routing software) can also utilize household data sets.

**7. Transit Route Planning Software Request for Proposals**

Mr. Maddox gave an update on the use and implementation of ReMix Transit Route Planning software. The original contract was signed in 2017, with a three year licensing extension. This purchase counts as a level two purchase, which does not necessitate a full RFP release. As of today, ReMix is the only known vendor to offer this software as needed by MATBUS. Purchase of the software licensing is included in the 2021-2022 UPWP overhead budget, but the pricing may vary and may warrant modification to the UPWP.

**8. 2021 Bicycle & Pedestrian Count Report**

Mr. Farnsworth presented the 2021 Bicycle and Pedestrian count report.

**9. Meeting Highlights from ND MPO/NDDOT 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter Meeting**

Ms. Gray presented an update from the North Dakota MPO/NDDOT first quarter meeting.

**10. July TTC Meeting Date**

As Independence Day falls on a Sunday, Ms. Gray asked the committee on their thoughts for a July meeting. The response indicated that attendance will most likely result in a quorum.

**11. Agency Updates**

Fargo: Bidding out North University Drive project. 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue construction has started. City commission has approved the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ave Pedestrian bridge project financing and will send the acceptance letter.

Moorhead: underpass construction continues. Bike trail construction.

West Fargo: Sheyenne Street construction.

MnDOT: Submitting draft STIP

Freight: NDDOT Vision Zero safety emphasis team with Mr. Wolter as chair

**12. Additional Business**

No additional business.

**13. Adjourn**

The 517 Regular Meeting of the TTC was adjourned on April 8, 2021 at 11:25 a.m.

**THE NEXT FM METRO COG TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING WILL BE HELD May13, 2021, 10:00 A.M.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Savanna Leach  
Executive Assistant

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Dan Farnsworth, Transportation Planner  
**Date:** May 7, 2021  
**Re:** **FM Metropolitan Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan - Consultant Selection**

In March, the Metro COG Policy Board approved the request for proposals (RFP) for the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update. This project has a budgeted amount of \$170,000 (\$136,000 funded via Federal CPG funds and \$34,000 funded with local funds).

The deadline for consulting firms to submit proposals was April 14<sup>th</sup>. Metro COG received proposals from three firms - Alta Planning + Design, Toole Design, and Ulteig. Metro COG and the consultant selection committee met on Wednesday May 5<sup>th</sup> to interview and select one of the three firms.

Upon interviewing all three firms, Alta (with subconsultants SRF and Asakura Robinson) was the highest ranked team. Alta's cost proposal came in at \$169,951, which is within the project's budgeted amount.

**Requested Action:**

**Recommend Policy Board approval of Metro COG entering into a contract with Alta Planning + Design for the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update.**

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee (TTC)  
**From:** Luke Champa  
**Date:** May 6, 2021  
**Re:** **17<sup>th</sup> Street N Corridor Study Final Report**

In March 2020, Metro COG, in cooperation with the City of Moorhead, kicked-off the 17<sup>th</sup> St N Corridor Study. Metro COG contracted with Bolton & Menk (prime consultant) and Toole Design (subconsultant) to lead the study.

This study takes a comprehensive look at the 17<sup>th</sup> St N corridor as a whole from 1<sup>st</sup> Ave N to 15<sup>th</sup> Ave N in anticipation of a scheduled rehabilitation project in 2022 and future improvement needs. The corridor has a mix of land uses including commercial, institutional, and residential which provide a mix of automobiles, bicyclists, pedestrians, buses (school, transit), and heavy commercial vehicles. All of which is compounded by an ultra-wide, 60-foot curb to curb width. 17<sup>th</sup> St N poses unique safety, maintenance, and contextual challenges.

The purpose of this study is to identify future improvements for 17<sup>th</sup> St N by obtaining public input, reviewing the existing conditions and local needs, and developing alternatives, planning level cost estimates, and an implementation strategy for the corridor. The Plan was guided by a 15-member Study Review Committee and had extensive public involvement.

The City of Moorhead Planning Commission convened on Wednesday, May 5<sup>th</sup> and recommended approval of the 17<sup>th</sup> St N Corridor Study to the Moorhead City Council, who meets on Monday, May 10<sup>th</sup>. The 17<sup>th</sup> St N Corridor Study Final Draft Report may be found here:

[http://fmmetrocog.org/application/files/7016/2015/6432/05.02.2021\\_FINAL\\_MetroCOG\\_Final\\_Report\\_Reduced.pdf](http://fmmetrocog.org/application/files/7016/2015/6432/05.02.2021_FINAL_MetroCOG_Final_Report_Reduced.pdf)

Or you may also visit the project webpage: <http://fmmetrocog.org/Moorhead-17th-st-n>

**Requested Action:**  
**Recommend Approval of the 17<sup>th</sup> Street N Corridor Study to the Metro COG Policy Board.**

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Michael Maddox, AICP  
**Date:** 05/06/2021  
**Re:** **Employment & Household Data – Vendor Selection**

Every five-years Metro COG acquires regional household and employment datasets which are used to develop the regional Traffic Demand Model (TDM). The datasets provide the basis for the Trip Generation step of the TDM, and reflect the base level conditions of the region, ultimately informing trip origins and destinations and trip distribution. Each dataset (employment and household) is comprised of numerous attributes, including the geographic area or specific address.

Metro COG is working with the Advanced Traffic Analysis Center (ATAC) at NDSU to evaluate what information is required for the update to the TDM. ATAC provided Metro COG staff with a list of vendors who could potentially fulfill the data needs for the TDM update. Three vendors were contacted, including Data-Axel, Kochava, and Replica. Metro COG attempted to contact a fourth company, but the email address provided on the company's website bounced-back. ATAC also developed a specifications document (Attachment 1) which details the specific attributes datasets must include. Such attributes include (but are not limited to):

#### **Household Dataset:**

- People per Household
- Household Income
- Age (especially school age children)
- Vehicle Ownership

#### **Employment Dataset:**

- National American Industry Classification System (NAICS) 2-digit code
- Number of People Employed
- Address

This specifications document is included as an attachment to this memo. Each dataset must reflect a one-month time period. Metro COG will select a month in Fall 2021 (likely October) for which the data will be provided. The datasets must be real-time reflections of household and employment activity within that month time period. The specifications document was provided to each of the companies that were contacted.

Metro COG staff met with three vendors virtually and/or communicated with each through email and phone conversations, reviewed examples of each vendor's data, and solicited formal quotes of the cost to provide the datasets. Diomo Motuba provided his expert opinion in analyzing each company's datasets. Metro COG staff, with the assistance of ATAC, determined which company could provide the best data. Metro COG staff then reviewed the cost proposals and compared that with the data the company could provide, ultimately concluding in a preferred data vendor.

After this review, it was apparent that Data-Axel could not only provide the data that best meets our needs, but also provide it for \$5,534.00, which is within Metro COG's budget for this element of the UPWP. Other vendors were far less specific about the cost of their data, as their pricing is based on the number of data elements, the exact number of which is unknown at this time, but would end up costing far more than the quote from Data-Axel. A summary of the findings of the review of each company's datasets are included as an attachment to this memo (Attachments 2-4).

This purchase meets the Level 1 "micro" purchase threshold identified in NDDOT's purchasing thresholds. Upon Policy Board approval, Metro COG will begin working with Data-Axel to set up the data collection parameters and time frame well in advance of when we want the data collected.

**Requested Action: Recommend selection of Data-Axel to the Policy Board as the preferred vendor to supply employment and household data to Metro COG.**





## SOCIOECONOMIC DATA COLLECTION TO SUPPORT TRAVEL DEMAND MODELING – FM METROCOG- DATA SPECIFICATIONS

The data collected will be used in the travel demand model for the FM Metro COG. There are two main sets of data that need to be provided, household and employment data. All data should have the capabilities to be aggregated into the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) geographies for the FM Metro COG Travel demand model. The data does not need to be provided in the TAZ geographies structure, however, the data should be easily aggregated into the TAZ geographies. Point GIS data for the different households and employment data are possible formats that will fit this purpose. GIS shapefiles are the preferred data delivery format. Two main data are required- household and employment data as described next.

### Household Data

The household data shows the characteristics of the households in the area aggregated into TAZ geographies. Therefore, any data provided should have the capability to be aggregated into individual TAZ geographies for each data category. The main data that will be required for households are persons in households cross tabbed with vehicle ownership data, persons in households cross tabbed with :

- A. **Persons in Households and vehicle ownership cross tabs (HH\_PPX\_VY) –**  
(Number of Persons Per Households cross tabbed with the number of vehicles per household for each TAZ).
  - i. Where HH= households,
  - ii. PPX is the persons per household with X representing the number of persons per household. X ranges from 1 to greater than or equal to 5 (all households greater than five are included in the 5).
  - iii. V represents vehicles and Y is the number of vehicles and ranges from 0 to 3 (  $0 < Y \leq 3$  )

For example, HH\_PP1\_V0 is the number of households with one person and 0 vehicles. Similarly, HH\_PP5\_V3 is the number of households with 5 persons that own 3 vehicles. Table 1 shows the structure of the persons per household/vehicle ownership data that will be used in the travel demand model. For this example, TAZ 1 has 15 households that have one person and zero cars, 7 households that have 1 person and 1 vehicle, and 3 households that have 5 persons and 3 vehicles. The data provided does not have to be in this format, however, FM MetroCOG should have the capability to convert the data into this format.

Table 1 Travel Demand Model Household and Vehicle Ownership Cross Tab Example

TAZ #	HH_PP1_V0	HH_PP1_V1	HH_PP2_V0	...	HH_PP5_V3
1	15	7	6	...	3
2	8	12	2	...	4
3	3	5	12	...	6

**B. Persons in Household and income cross tabs for each TAZ (HH\_PPX\_IncW)**

This shows the number of persons different household sizes cross tabbed with income ranges for each TAZ. Household sizes range from 1 to greater than equal to 5.

HH\_PPX\_IncW are defined as follows

- i. HH= households,
- ii. PPX is the persons per household with X representing the number of persons per household. X ranges from 1 to greater than or equal to 5 (all households greater than five are included in the 5).
- iii. Inc represents income and W is the income range with four income classes (W ranges from 1-4)
  - 1. Households with income less than \$35,000 (Inc<\$35,000)
  - 2. Households with income greater than or equal to \$35,000 and less than \$50,000 (\$35K≤ Inc <\$50K)
  - 3. Households with income greater than or equal to \$50,000 and less than or equal to \$100,000 (\$50K≤ Inc < \$100K)
  - 4. Households with income greater than or equal to \$100,000 (\$Inc≥\$100K)

For example, HH\_PP1\_Inc1 is the number of households with one person and an income class 1 i.e. household income less than \$35K. Similarly, HH\_PP5\_Inc3 is the number of households with 5 persons with household income between \$50K and less than \$100K. Table 2 shows the structure of the persons per household/vehicle ownership data that will be used in the travel demand model. For this example, TAZ 1 has 5 households that have one person and are in income class 1, 6 households that have 1 person and in income class 2, and 15 households that have 5 persons and are in income class 3. The data provided does not have to be in this format, however, FM MetroCOG should have the capability to convert the data into this format.

Table 2 Travel Demand Model Household and income classes Cross Tab Example

TAZ #	HH_PP1_Inc1	HH_PP1_Inc2	HH_PP1_Inc3	...	HH_PP5_Inc3
1	5	6	12	...	15
2	8	5	6	...	9
3	7	13	9	...	6

**C. K-12 Age Ranges and College Age Range**

This data will show the total number of children in K-12 for different age groups including grade, middle, high school age groups, and for college-age students 19-23-year-olds per TAZ. Table 3 shows an example of how the data will be represented in the travel demand model. For example, TAZ # 1 has 2 kids in grade school, 3 kids in middle school, 6 kids in high school, and 7-college age kids.

Table 3 Travel Demand Model Total Number of kids for each School Grade

TAZ #	School Grade and Age Range			
	5-10 (Grade)	11-13 (Middle)	14-18 (High)	18-23( College)
1	2	3	6	7
2	5	1	5	5
3	4	2	3	2

**Employment data**

The employment data should show the number of people employed grouped in the 2-digit NAICS categories listed below for each TAZ or the FM Metro COG should have the capability to group the data into the TAZs using the 2-digit NAICS code.

- i. **Manufacturing (NAICS 31-33)**
- ii. **Construction and resources (NAICS 21, 23)**
- iii. **Retail (NAICS 44-45)**
- iv. **Service (NAICS 52,53,55,56,56,51,,62,71,81,99)**
- v. **Agriculture (NAICS 11)**
- vi. **Wholesale Trade, Trans Utilities (NAICS:22,48-49,42)**
- vii. **Education (NAICS 61)**



**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Cindy Gray, Executive Director  
**Date:** May 7, 2021  
**Re:** **Draft 2022 Budget**

Metro COG typically develops its budget for the next year in the spring in order to have an approved budget ready for local jurisdictions when they are preparing their annual budgets for the upcoming year. The components of Metro COG's 2022 budget are attached for your review. They include:

- Overhead and Operations (Attachment 1)
- Projects – Contracted to Consultants (Attachment 2)
- Historical comparison of Local Dues (Attachment 3)

Increases from 2021 include estimates of increased medical/dental/vision insurance and HSA costs, an estimated annual salary adjustment, salary step increases, and estimated increases in several areas of overhead.

While our budget overall is increasing, the cost of local dues is relatively stable compared with 2021. This is largely due to part of the local share for the Interstate Operations Analysis being paid by North Dakota Department of Transportation, and additional funds for the Interstate Operations Analysis and all of the TH 10 Corridor Study through Dilworth being paid by MnDOT. You will notice that our budget for operations and overhead is increasing. One reason for this increase is that we have retained staff for the past few years, with the exception of one Assistant Planner. This has resulted in promotions and the progression of staff into the upper step levels of the salary ranges. The advantage to this is that we have very experienced staff members who have been through multiple cycles of various plan updates (e.g. transit development plan, metropolitan transportation plan, bicycle/pedestrian plan), and are very capable of dealing with new requirements and complex challenges that arise.

A summary of the estimated 2022 local dues using the approved dues formula used over the past several years is shown below.

Summary of Local Dues/Match Amt.	Cass Co.	Clay Co.	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo	Other (MnDOT)
<b>Approved Dues Formula</b>	<b>7.7%</b>	<b>8.2%</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>50.0%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	
Operations and Overhead	\$14,384	\$15,231	\$3,625	\$92,981	\$2,189	\$34,286	\$23,266	\$26,820
Project Costs	\$3,604	\$3,817	\$908	\$52,300	\$548	\$10,592	\$5,830	\$88,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$17,988</b>	<b>\$19,048</b>	<b>\$4,533</b>	<b>\$145,281</b>	<b>\$2,737</b>	<b>\$44,878</b>	<b>\$29,096</b>	<b>\$114,820</b>

Given the expectation that the 2020 US Census results will alter the population percentages within metropolitan area, the Executive Committee asked that the local dues also be calculated based on recent population estimates to gain an understanding of how local dues are likely to change in the near future. The table below shows the breakdown of local dues based on 2019 population estimates for local jurisdictions.

The 2019 Metropolitan Planning Area population percentages are as follows:

Jurisdiction	Cass Co	Clay Co	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo
2019 Estimated Population Percentage	5%	5.8%	1.9%	52.1%	1.2%	18.4%	15.5%

However, please note:

- Only areas within the metropolitan planning area that are not part of member jurisdictions are part of the population total for Cass and Clay Counties, and
- Metro COG's Articles of Association **limit any single jurisdiction's share of local match to no more than 50 percent.** This affects Fargo's local match, as the 2019 population estimate is approximately 52.1 percent. The remaining 2.1 percent is split proportionally to the remaining jurisdictions.

A summary of estimated local dues using the updated 2019 population estimates and the limitation of no more than 50% for any individual jurisdiction is shown below.

Summary of Local Dues/Match Amt.	Cass Co.	Clay Co.	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo	Other (MnDOT)
Local Match based on 2019 Population Estimates	5.3%	6.1%	2.0%	50.0%	1.3%	19.3%	16.2%	
Operations and Overhead	\$9,800	\$11,307	\$3,663	\$92,981	\$2,380	\$35,798	\$30,033	\$26,820
Project Costs	\$2,456	\$2,833	\$918	\$52,300	\$596	\$10,971	\$7,526	\$88,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$12,256</b>	<b>\$14,140</b>	<b>\$4,581</b>	<b>\$145,281</b>	<b>\$2,977</b>	<b>\$46,768</b>	<b>\$37,559</b>	<b>\$114,820</b>
<b>Difference from Approved Formula</b>	<b>- \$5,732</b>	<b>- \$4,908</b>	<b>+ \$49</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>+ \$240</b>	<b>+ \$1,890</b>	<b>+ \$8,463</b>	

Given that the results of the 2020 Census are several months away, Metro COG's Policy Board may decide to use the existing formula until such time as the results are available, or they may opt to use an updated formula using 2019 estimates, or a stepped formula that transitions the percentages in the direction they are heading. Several additional factors are expected to influence these estimates. They include:

- Compensation study recommendations (requested by Policy Board)
- Additional member jurisdictions (further follow-up is needed)
- Federal and state revenue (good estimates have been provided, but not final numbers)

Aside from some increases in certain overhead costs, the budget is very similar to the estimates put forth in the approved 2021-2022 UPWP.

**Recommended Action:**

**Option 1 - Recommend approval of the draft 2022 budget to the Policy Board using the approved local dues formula.**

**Option 2 – Recommend approval of the draft 2022 budget to the Policy Board using a revised dues formula based on the 2019 population estimates.**

**Option 3 – Recommend approval of the draft 2022 budget to the Policy Board using an interim dues formula that begins to bring the local match roughly halfway between the existing dues formula and the revised calculations based on the 2019 population estimates.**

# Jurisdiction Operations Dues Summary - 2022 Budget

Dues and Local Match on Contracted Planning Projects	Participating Jurisdictions	Jurisdiction								Total Cost Split Between Jurisdictions
		Cass Co.	Clay Co.	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo	Other	
<b>Metro COG Dues</b>		<b>20 Percent Local Match Distributed by Jurisdiction</b>								
Approved Dues Formula		7.7%	8.2%	1.9%	50.0%	1.2%	18.4%	12.5%	0.0%	100.00%
<b>Internal Operations (eligible costs)</b>										
Metro COG Personnel (Total Loaded Wage)	All	\$10,142.32	\$10,739.97	\$2,555.74	\$65,562.73	\$1,543.35	\$24,176.05	\$16,405.29	\$26,820.00	\$ 789,727.30
Metro COG Overhead Costs	All	\$3,506.33	\$3,712.95	\$883.55	\$22,665.89	\$533.56	\$8,357.98	\$5,671.52	\$0.00	\$ 226,658.92
MnDOT Match Requirement	All	\$518.62	\$549.18	\$130.69	\$3,352.50	\$78.92	\$1,236.22	\$838.87	\$0.00	\$ 6,705.00
<b>Total Dues (Internal)</b>		<b>\$14,167.27</b>	<b>\$15,002.10</b>	<b>\$3,569.99</b>	<b>\$91,581.12</b>	<b>\$2,155.83</b>	<b>\$33,770.25</b>	<b>\$22,915.69</b>	<b>\$26,820.00</b>	<b>\$1,023,091.22</b>
<b>Internal Operations (ineligible costs)</b>	All	\$216.57	\$229.34	\$54.57	\$1,400.00	\$32.96	\$516.25	\$350.31		\$2,800.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$14,383.84</b>	<b>\$15,231.44</b>	<b>\$3,624.56</b>	<b>\$92,981.12</b>	<b>\$2,188.79</b>	<b>\$34,286.50</b>	<b>\$23,266.00</b>	<b>\$26,820.00</b>	<b>\$1,025,891.22</b>

## Jurisdiction Project Dues Summary - 2022 Budget

Dues and Local Match on Contracted Planning Projects	Participating Jurisdictions	Jurisdiction <sup>1</sup>								Total Cost	Federal Share <sup>2</sup>	Federal %	Local Share	Local %
		Cass Co.	Clay Co.	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo	Other					
Approved Metro COG Dues Formula		7.7%	8.2%	1.9%	50.0%	1.2%	18.4%	12.5%	0.0%	100.00%				
<b>Regional Contracted Planning Projects</b>														
NDSU ATAC Annual Participation (TDM Model Dev)	All	\$154.70	\$163.81	\$38.98	\$1,000.00	\$23.54	\$368.75	\$250.22	\$0.00	\$10,000.00	\$8,000.00	80%	\$2,000.00	20%
Dynamiic Traffic Assignment Analyses (ATAC)	All	\$77.35	\$81.91	\$19.49	\$500.00	\$11.77	\$184.37	\$125.11	\$0.00	\$5,000.00	\$4,000.00	80%	\$1,000.00	20%
ITS Update (ATAC)	All	\$433.15	\$458.67	\$109.15	\$2,800.00	\$65.91	\$1,032.49	\$700.62	\$0.00	\$28,000.00	\$22,400.00	80%	\$5,600.00	20%
Demographic Forecast Update	All	\$773.48	\$819.06	\$194.91	\$5,000.00	\$117.70	\$1,843.73	\$1,251.11	\$0.00	\$50,000.00	\$40,000.00	80%	\$10,000.00	20%
Travel Demand Model Update (ATAC)	All	\$928.18	\$982.87	\$233.89	\$6,000.00	\$141.24	\$2,212.48	\$1,501.34	\$0.00	\$60,000.00	\$48,000.00	80%	\$12,000.00	20%
Interstate Operations Analysis (\$200,000 in 2021 and \$200,000 in 2022, 2-year project with NDDOT and MnDOT funding participation) <sup>4</sup>	All	\$1,237.57	\$1,310.50	\$311.85	\$8,000.00	\$188.32	\$2,949.97	\$2,001.78	\$56,000.00	\$200,000.00	\$128,000.00	80%	\$16,000.00	20%
<b>Total - Projects Shared Across Metro Area</b>		<b>\$3,604.43</b>	<b>\$3,816.82</b>	<b>\$908.27</b>	<b>\$23,300.00</b>	<b>\$548.48</b>	<b>\$8,591.80</b>	<b>\$5,830.19</b>	<b>\$56,000.00</b>	<b>\$353,000.00</b>	<b>\$250,400.00</b>		<b>\$46,600.00</b>	
<b>Jurisdiction-Specific Contracted Planning Studies</b>														
Red River Greenway Study <sup>5</sup>	Fargo				\$29,000.00					\$145,000.00	\$116,000.00	80%	\$29,000.00	20%
TH 10 Corridor Study Through Dilworth <sup>3</sup>	MnDOT and Dilworth								\$32,000.00	\$160,000.00	\$128,000.00	80%	\$32,000.00	20%
Moorhead Intersection Data Collection	Moorhead						\$2,000.00			\$10,000.00	\$8,000.00	80%	\$2,000.00	20%
<b>Total - Jurisdiction-Specific Planning Studies</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$29,000.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$2,000.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$32,000.00</b>	<b>\$315,000.00</b>	<b>\$252,000.00</b>		<b>\$63,000.00</b>	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$3,604.43</b>	<b>\$3,816.82</b>	<b>\$908.27</b>	<b>\$52,300.00</b>	<b>\$548.48</b>	<b>\$10,591.80</b>	<b>\$5,830.19</b>	<b>\$88,000.00</b>	<b>\$668,000.00</b>	<b>\$502,400.00</b>		<b>\$109,600.00</b>	

Notes:

<sup>1</sup>Contracted Studies will be billed to jurisdictions when the project is to begin.

<sup>2</sup>Contracted Planning Studies are contingent on the availability of federal funding.

<sup>3</sup>Local match from MnDOT

<sup>4</sup>Funding participation anticipated from NDDOT and MnDOT

<sup>5</sup>Increase budget if funding is higher than estimated. Seek additional funding (or local match) from Fargo Park District.



## Comparison of Proposed 2022 Local Match Amounts with Prior Four Years (2018-2021)

Local Match by Year	Jurisdictions							Other	Total
	Cass Co	Clay Co	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo	MnDOT, NDDOT	
	7.7%	8.2%	1.9%	50.0%	1.2%	18.4%	12.5%	or FM Diversion Auth.	
<b>2018 (included use of 2014 CPG Funds)</b>									
Local Match - Operations & Overhead	\$10,353	\$10,963	\$2,609	\$66,925	\$1,575	\$24,679	\$16,377	\$12,645	\$146,127
Local Match - Contracted Projects	\$44,547	\$10,110	\$2,406	\$133,059	\$31,453	\$89,680	\$17,976	\$40,000	\$369,230
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$54,900</b>	<b>\$21,073</b>	<b>\$5,015</b>	<b>\$199,984</b>	<b>\$33,028</b>	<b>\$114,358</b>	<b>\$34,353</b>	<b>\$52,645</b>	<b>\$515,357</b>
								Total budget: \$2,556,828	
<b>2019</b>									
Local Match - Operations & Overhead	\$11,101	\$11,593	\$2,797	\$71,758	\$1,689	\$26,461	\$17,956	\$26,820	\$170,174
Local Match - Contracted Projects	\$5,105	\$5,406	\$1,286	\$62,466	\$777	\$12,169	\$48,257	\$40,000	\$175,466
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$16,206</b>	<b>\$16,998</b>	<b>\$4,084</b>	<b>\$134,224</b>	<b>\$2,466</b>	<b>\$38,629</b>	<b>\$66,213</b>	<b>\$66,820</b>	<b>\$345,640</b>
								Total budget: \$1,540,237	
<b>2020</b>									
Local Match - Operations & Overhead	\$12,684	\$13,431	\$3,196	\$81,991	\$1,930	\$30,234	\$20,516	\$26,820	\$190,802
Local Match - Contracted Projects	\$696	\$737	\$175	\$66,300	\$14,506	\$38,834	\$12,633	\$75,000	\$208,882
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13,380</b>	<b>\$14,168</b>	<b>\$3,372</b>	<b>\$148,291</b>	<b>\$16,436</b>	<b>\$69,068</b>	<b>\$33,149</b>	<b>\$101,820</b>	<b>\$399,684</b>
								Total budget: \$1,736,367.21	
<b>2021 (proposed)</b>									
Local Match - Operations & Overhead	\$13,407	\$14,197	\$3,378	\$86,669	\$2,040	\$31,959	\$21,686	\$26,820	\$200,157
Local Match - Contracted Projects	\$6,265	\$6,634	\$1,579	\$70,500	\$953	\$16,934	\$10,134	\$56,000	\$168,999
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$19,672</b>	<b>\$20,831</b>	<b>\$4,957</b>	<b>\$157,169</b>	<b>\$2,993</b>	<b>\$48,893</b>	<b>\$31,820</b>	<b>\$82,820</b>	<b>\$369,156</b>
								Total budget: \$1,596,326	
<b>2022 (proposed)</b>									
Local Match - Operations & Overhead	\$14,384	\$15,231	\$3,625	\$92,981	\$2,189	\$34,286	\$23,266	\$26,820	\$212,782
Local Match - Contracted Projects	\$3,604	\$3,817	\$908	\$52,300	\$548	\$10,592	\$5,830	\$88,000	\$165,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$17,988</b>	<b>\$19,048</b>	<b>\$4,533</b>	<b>\$145,281</b>	<b>\$2,737</b>	<b>\$44,878</b>	<b>\$29,096</b>	<b>\$114,820</b>	<b>\$378,382</b>
								Total budget: \$1,693,891	

## Kochava Dataset Evaluation

Kochava's data focuses on information gleaned from mobile device usage, and as such, focuses more on tracking user app experiences. They do collect some demographic information about the device user. However, this data does not include the attributes that are necessary for the TDM. They also track location-based information, but this information would not necessarily be able to provide clear destinations for trips within the region.

Staff met with Travis Talaska of Kochava on two occasions to go through their data products. After these meetings, staff asked for examples of datasets as well as a formal quote for how much it would cost to acquire the data. Mr. Talaska provided this quote via email. The email message containing this quote is saved in the project file.

Kochava's pricing model is somewhat hard to distinguish what actual costs are going to be. The charge per information sheet with a base price.

**Given the different intent of their data from what Metro COG desires, staff has determined that Kochava's datasets would not meet the needs for the TDM and therefore should not be selected as the preferred vendor for employment and household data.**

## Replica Dataset Evaluation

Replica was identified by ATAC as a company who could possibly provide the type of data necessary for the TDM. Staff reached out to a representative of Replica, who demonstrated Replica's data platform to staff. Replica provides a cloud-based platform that provides two products, Replica Trends and Replica Places. More detailed information about these products can be found in their formal quote.

After demonstration and review of the platform, staff determined that Replica's service is similar to the Streetlight platform that Metro COG currently purchases. The "Places" platform would be most apt in fulfilling the TDM's data needs. However, Replica's data focuses on trips rather than the background socioeconomic information.

Being that it is a platform, Replica utilizes a subscription-based pricing model with user licenses, support, training, as well as other services. Replica proposed a two-year subscription term, whereas Metro COG is interested in purchasing data for a one-month time period. Replica's pricing model is based upon Fargo's population or on regional population. Single access (access only by the MPO) is based upon Fargo's population (122,000). Staff is unsure if "single access" is purchased, if regional information would be provided or just information with Fargo's municipal boundary.

Being that the pricing model is based upon a per person cost for total population, the annual cost of the product is well beyond the budget for the purchase of employment and household data. The platform that Replica provides is redundant with the Streetlight platform that Metro COG has already purchased through MnDOT.

**Staff recommends that Replica is not chosen as the preferred vendor for employment and household information data.**

## **Data-Axel Dataset Evaluation**

Joel Kaufman from Data-Axel contacted Metro COG months before staff were ready to look for data vendors. He provided information in a timely manner and even sought clarifications to ATAC's and Metro COG's TDM specifications memo. Joel worked very diligently to address concerns, provide clarity on what data to purchase and when to purchase it, and provided examples of such data.

Data-Axel was formerly Infogroup USA, who provided the data for the last update to the TDM. At that time, the data received required a lot of time and effort to process. This was due to miscommunication about the attributes of new versus historic data. Joel addressed this issue at the forefront of our conversations and has cleared up any misconceptions that we may have given the last experience. Upon review of the data, it contains all of the necessary attributes and many more attributes that would be useful for the TDM update. The quote came in significantly underneath the project budget, even as much that multiple months could be purchased instead of one.

**Staff recommends Data-Axel be the preferred vendor for employment and household data.**



# QUOTE

Quote Number: 5312021-1JTK  
 Date: 5/03/2021  
 Offer Valid Until: 9/30/2021

Rep: Joel Kaufman  
 13155 Noel Road, Suite 1750  
 Dallas, TX 75240  
 Phone: 402-836-1105  
 Email: joel.kaufman@data-axle.com

Client: Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan COG  
 Contact Name: Michael Maddox  
 Address: 1 2<sup>nd</sup> Street N, #232  
 City, State, Zip: Fargo, ND 58102  
 Email: maddox@fmmetrocog.org  
 Billing Phone: 701-232-3242

Delivery Method	Delivery Date	Payment Terms
Email/FTP	Receipt of PO	N30

QTY	ITEM #	DESCRIPTION	UNIT PRICE	DISCOUNT	LINE TOTAL
~12K	US Business Data	Verified business records	\$0.197	\$	\$2,364.00
~2K	US Business Data	Pre-Verified business records	\$0.100	\$	\$200.00
~110K	US Consumer Data	US Households	\$0.052	\$0.027	\$2,970.00
			\$	\$	\$
			\$	\$	\$
			\$	\$	\$
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>					<b>\$5,534.00</b>
<b>DISCOUNT</b>					<b>\$</b>
<b>Tax (if applicable)</b>					<b>\$</b>
<b>Shipping (if applicable)</b>					<b>\$</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>\$5,534.00</b>

Qty of Records: ~14K businesses, ~110K households  
 Product: US Business and US Consumer Data  
 Geography: Cass County, ND; Clay County, MN  
 Selection Criteria: NO ATM machines, Video rental Kiosks, blank or incomplete addresses  
 Update: NONE

Permitted Use of Licensed Data: Travel-Demand Modeling, Transportation Research & GIS Work

License term: ONE yr(s). Client agrees to delete licensed data upon expiration of license period.

Where client orders these products or services from Data Axle pursuant to this quote (as identified on either parties PO) the following terms shall apply: [Terms and Conditions](#)

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee (TTC)  
**From:** Luke Champa  
**Date:** May 7, 2021  
**Re:** **Draft Fargo-Moorhead-West Fargo COVID-19 Analysis and Monitoring Report**

In March 2020, Metro COG began tracking the transportation impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in the FM Area. From traffic volume, peak spreading, bike and pedestrian activity, and transit ridership this report encompasses numerous travel modes that were impacted throughout 2020.

The Draft COVID-19 Analysis and Monitoring Report compiles traffic data, transit ridership data, and bike/ped data from across the Fargo-Moorhead-West Fargo Area (FM Area).

The purpose of this report is to quantify and summarize the travel impacts that the FM Area witnessed in 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Also, the report introduces and tests the capabilities of two relatively new programs including StreetLight and Strava. Both programs are highlighted throughout the plan, with a deep exploration of the capabilities of StreetLight data and a brief synopsis of Strava data. StreetLight was used to monitor not only roadways but a variety of land uses and major employers across the FM Area.

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted travel in the FM Area substantially throughout 2020 however, travel patterns appear to be coming back to normal levels. If not only a snapshot and record of how 2020 impacted travel in the region, the information contained within the report may be used to address current and future policies that impact transportation, identifies critical parts of the transportation network, and highlights how resilient the FM Area's transportation network is.

To view the draft report online please follow this link:

[http://fmmetrocog.org/application/files/3216/2042/4509/Draft\\_COVID-19\\_Analysis\\_Report\\_r.pdf](http://fmmetrocog.org/application/files/3216/2042/4509/Draft_COVID-19_Analysis_Report_r.pdf)

For more information regarding the report or data found herein, please contact Luke Champa, Assistant Transportation Planner, via email ([champa@fmmetrocog.org](mailto:champa@fmmetrocog.org)), or call (701) 532-5107.