

The 589th Policy Board Meeting Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

THURSDAY, May 20, 2021 – 4:00 p.m.
Fargo, North Dakota

OVERALL AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Introductions
 - a. Introductions Information Item
 - b. Approve Order and Contents of the Overall Agenda Action Item
 - c. Approve Minutes of the April 15, 2021 Board Meeting Action Item
 - d. Approve May 2021 Bills Action Item
2. Consent Agenda Action Item
 - a. April End of Month Report
 - b. 2021 Household and Employment Data Purchase
3. Regular Agenda
 - a. Public Comment Opportunity Public Input
 - b. FM Metro Bike/Ped Plan Update Consultant Selection Action Item
 - c. Moorhead 17th Street N Corridor Study Final Report Action Item
 - d. Draft 2022 UPWP Budget Action Item
 - e. 2023-2024 TAP Grant Awards Information Item
4. Additional Business Information Item
5. Adjourn

REMINDER: The next Metro COG Policy Board Meeting will be held Thursday, June 17, 2021 at 4:00 p.m.

Due to ongoing public health concerns related to COVID-19, Metro COG is encouraging citizens to provide their comments on agenda items via email to 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_41_bJKcHRjOZLr6s5GMzQg

Red Action Items require roll call votes.

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

NOTE: Given the participation of Fargo City Commissioners at Policy Board meetings, such meetings may constitute open public meetings of the City of Fargo.

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.

Agenda Item 1c, Attachment 1

588th Policy Board Meeting Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments Thursday, April 15, 2021 – 4:00 pm Zoom Web Conference

Members Present:

Matthew	Gilbertson	Moorhead City Council
John	Gunkelman	Fargo Planning Commission
Chuck	Hendrickson	Moorhead City Council
Jim	Kapitan	Cass County Commission
Steve	Lindaas	Moorhead City Council
Jenny	Mongeau	Clay County Commission
Julie	Nash	Dilworth City Council
Brad	Olson	West Fargo City Commission
Dave	Piepkorn	Fargo City Commission
Arlette	Preston	Fargo City Commission
Rocky	Schneider	Fargo Planning Commission
John	Strand	Fargo City Commission

Members Absent:

Tony	Gehrig	Fargo City Commission
Amanda	George	West Fargo City Commission
Maranda	Tasa	Fargo Planning Commission
Jeff	Trudeau	City of Horace

Others Present:

Adam	Altenburg	Metro COG
Luke	Champa	Metro COG
Ari	Del Rosario	Metro COG
Dan	Farnsworth	Metro COG
Cindy	Gray	Metro COG
Matthew	Huettl	HDR
Joe	Kapper	SRF Consulting
Savanna	Leach	Metro COG
Michael	Maddox	Metro COG
Bob	Walton	NDDOT – Fargo District

1a. **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER, WELCOME, AND INTRODUCTIONS, convened**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm, on April 15, 2021 by Chair Nash, noting a quorum was present. Introductions were made.

1b. **Approve Order and Contents of Overall Agenda, approved**

Chair Nash asked for approval for the overall agenda.

MOTION: Approve the contents of the Overall Agenda of the April 15, 2021 Policy Board Meeting.

Mr. Lindaas moved, seconded by Ms. Mongeau

MOTION, passed

Motion carried unanimously.

1c. Past Meeting Minutes, approved

Chair Nash asked for approval of the Minutes of the March 18, 2021 Meeting.

MOTION: Approve the March 18, 2021 Policy Board Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Olson moved, seconded by Mr. Lindaas

MOTION, passed

Motion carried unanimously.

1d. Monthly Bills, approved

Chair Nash asked for approval of the April 2021 Bills as listed on Attachment 1d.

MOTION: Approve the April 2021 Bills List.

Mr. Kapitan moved, seconded by Mr. Gunkelman

MOTION, passed

Motion carried unanimously.

2. CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Nash asked for approval of Items a-b on the Consent Agenda.

a. March Month End Report

b. 2021 First Quarter Report

MOTION: Approve Items a-b on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Strand moved, seconded by Mr. Hendrickson

MOTION, passed

Motion carried unanimously.

3. REGULAR AGENDA

3a. Public Comment Opportunity

No public comments were made or received.

3b. Interstate Operations Analysis Consultant Selection

Ms. Gray presented HDR as the highest-ranked consultant chosen from six firms who submitted proposals. Ms. Gray gave background information on the project, and noted that the 12-member selection committee included representatives from Fargo, Moorhead, Clay County, Cass County, and West Fargo, MnDOT and NDDOT. Two ATAC/UGPTI staff members – Diomo Motuba and Kshitij Sharma – assisted the selection committee by listening to the interviews, discussing methodology, and interpreting some of the more technical aspects of the proposed analysis. The estimated project cost came in at \$399,417.63.

MOTION: Approve the selection of HDR as the consultant for the Interstate Operations Analysis and Plan for Future Improvements, and authorize the Executive Director to carry out negotiations and sign a contract with the HDR team.

Mr. Kapitan moved, seconded by Mr. Lindaas.

MOTION, passed

Motion carried unanimously.

3c. 2021 Bicycle & Pedestrian Count Report

Mr. Farnsworth presented the 2021 Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Report.

3d. Transit Development Plan Update

Mr. Maddox and Mr. Kapper of SRF Consulting Group presented an update to the on-going Transit Development Plan (TDP). The TDP is updated every five years, and is similar to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, but is focused on transit. However, this plan is setting a longer-range vision as there are implications due to the rapid growth that is occurring in this region and its subsequent transition to a Transportation Management Area (TMA).

The consultant team of SRF/AECOM is currently engaged in preparing system recommendations for possible future transit improvements. These changes vary from minor route adjustments that can be made in the short-term, to shifting the structure of routes and the operating scheme in the long-term.

These recommendations are currently in a draft form and have preliminarily been shared with management from the municipalities that participate in MATBUS transit service.

4. Additional Business

No additional business

5. Adjourn

The 588th Meeting of the FM Metro COG Policy Board held Thursday, April 15, 2021 was adjourned at 5:20 pm.

THE NEXT FM METRO COG POLICY BOARD MEETING WILL BE HELD May 20, 2021, 4:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Savanna Leach
Executive Assistant

To: Policy Board Members
From: Michael Maddox, AICP
Date: May 12, 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.

At their meeting on May 13th, the Transportation Technical Committee recommended that the Policy Board approve the purchase of Employment and Household Data from Data-Axel.

Requested Action: Selection of Data-Axel as the preferred vendor to supply employment and household data to Metro COG, and subsequent authority for the Metro COG Executive Director to enter into a contract with Data-Axel.

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 ($\$35K \leq \text{Inc} < \$50K$)
 - 3. Households with income greater than or equal to \$50,000 and less than or equal to \$100,000 ($\$50K \leq \text{Inc} < \$100K$)
 - 4. Households with income greater than or equal to \$100,000 ($\text{Inc} \geq \$100K$)

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)**

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 2nd 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
			\$	\$	\$
			\$	\$	\$
			\$	\$	\$
SUBTOTAL					\$5,534.00
DISCOUNT					\$
Tax (if applicable)					\$
Shipping (if applicable)					\$
TOTAL					\$5,534.00

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: Metro COG Policy Board
From: Dan Farnsworth, Transportation Planner
Date: May 14, 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 14th. 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 5th 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.

At their meeting on May 13, 2021, the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) recommended Policy Board approval of entering into a contract with Alta Planning + Design for the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update.

Requested Action:

Approval of the selection of Alta Planning + Design as the consultant for the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan Update and authorization of the Executive Director to enter into contract with Alta Planning + Design after negotiations.

To: Policy Board
From: Luke Champa, Assistant Transportation Planner
Date: May 12, 2021
Re: **17th Street N Corridor Study Final Report**

In March 2020, Metro COG in cooperation with the City of Moorhead, kicked-off the 17th 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 17th St N corridor as a whole from 1st Ave N to 15th 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. 17th St N poses unique safety, maintenance, and contextual challenges.

The purpose of this study is to identify future improvements for 17th 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.

Moorhead City Council recommended Metro COG Policy Board approval of the 17th Street N Corridor Study on May 10, 2021. The resolution of the recommendation may be found in Attachment 1. The 17th 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

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

Requested Action:
Approve 17th Street N Corridor Study.

RESOLUTION 2021-0510-B

Resolution to Approve 17th Street N Corridor Study

WHEREAS, in March 2020, MetroCOG and the City of Moorhead commenced the 17th Street N Corridor Study, and

WHEREAS, MetroCOG contracted with Bolton & Menk and Toole Design to complete the study; and

WHEREAS, the study takes a comprehensive look at the 17th Street N corridor from 1st Avenue N to 15th Avenue N in anticipation of the scheduled rehabilitation project in 2022; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the study was to identify future improvement needs and to develop alternative improvements based on public comments and the 15-member Study Review Committee; and

WHEREAS, the final draft report has been finalized and was recommended for approval by the Moorhead Planning Commission at their May 5, 2021 meeting.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Moorhead, Minnesota that the 17th Street N Corridor Study is recommended for approval to the MetroCOG Policy Board.

PASSED: May 10, 2021 by the City Council of the City of Moorhead.

APPROVED BY:



MICHELLE (SHELLY) A. CARLSON, Mayor

ATTEST:



CHRISTINA RUST, City Clerk



To: Policy Board
From: Cindy Gray, Executive Director
Date: May 14, 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. The details of our operations and overhead costs were reviewed with the Executive Committee at their May meeting.

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, applying 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)
Approved Dues Formula	7.7%	8.2%	1.9%	50.0%	1.2%	18.4%	12.5%	
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
Total	\$17,988	\$19,048	\$4,533	\$145,281	\$2,737	\$44,878	\$29,096	\$114,820

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
Total	\$12,256	\$14,140	\$4,581	\$145,281	\$2,977	\$46,768	\$37,559	\$114,820
Difference from Approved Formula	-\$5,732	-\$4,908	+\$49	\$0	+\$240	+\$1,890	+\$8,463	

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. Dues that reflect a "stepped up" approach, which applies 50 percent of the 2010 to 2019 change, is shown in the table below for your reference:

Summary of Local Dues/Match Amt.	Cass Co.	Clay Co.	Dilworth	Fargo	Horace	Moorhead	West Fargo	Other (MnDOT)
Using Stepped Up Percentages	6.5%	7.1%	1.9%	50.0%	1.2%	18.8%	14.3%	N/A
Operations and Overhead	\$12,060	\$13,278	\$3,598	\$92,981	\$2,306	\$35,007	\$26,639	\$26,820
Project Costs	\$3,022	\$3,327	\$902	\$52,300	\$578	\$10,772	\$6,675	\$88,000
Total	\$15,082	\$16,605	\$4,500	\$145,281	\$2,884	\$45,780	\$33,315	\$114,820
Difference from Approved Formula	-\$2,906	-\$2,443	-\$33	0	\$147	\$902	\$4,219	

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.

At their meeting on May 13th, the Transportation Technical Committee recommended that the Policy Board approve the draft 2022 budget using the revised dues formula shown herein based on the 2019 population estimates.

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	
Metro COG Dues		20 Percent Local Match Distributed by Jurisdiction								
Approved Dues Formula		7.7%	8.2%	1.9%	50.0%	1.2%	18.4%	12.5%	0.0%	100.00%
Internal Operations (eligible costs)										
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
Total Dues (Internal)		\$14,167.27	\$15,002.10	\$3,569.99	\$91,581.12	\$2,155.83	\$33,770.25	\$22,915.69	\$26,820.00	\$1,023,091.22
Internal Operations (ineligible costs)	All	\$216.57	\$229.34	\$54.57	\$1,400.00	\$32.96	\$516.25	\$350.31		\$2,800.00
Total		\$14,383.84	\$15,231.44	\$3,624.56	\$92,981.12	\$2,188.79	\$34,286.50	\$23,266.00	\$26,820.00	\$1,025,891.22

Jurisdiction Project Dues Summary - 2022 Budget

Dues and Local Match on Contracted Planning Projects	Participating Jurisdictions	Jurisdiction ¹								Total Cost	Federal Share ²	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%				
Regional Contracted Planning Projects														
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) ⁴	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%
Total - Projects Shared Across Metro Area		\$3,604.43	\$3,816.82	\$908.27	\$23,300.00	\$548.48	\$8,591.80	\$5,830.19	\$56,000.00	\$353,000.00	\$250,400.00		\$46,600.00	
Jurisdiction-Specific Contracted Planning Studies														
Red River Greenway Study ⁵	Fargo				\$29,000.00					\$145,000.00	\$116,000.00	80%	\$29,000.00	20%
TH 10 Corridor Study Through Dilworth ³	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%
Total - Jurisdiction-Specific Planning Studies		\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$29,000.00	\$0.00	\$2,000.00	\$0.00	\$32,000.00	\$315,000.00	\$252,000.00		\$63,000.00	
Grand Total		\$3,604.43	\$3,816.82	\$908.27	\$52,300.00	\$548.48	\$10,591.80	\$5,830.19	\$88,000.00	\$668,000.00	\$502,400.00		\$109,600.00	

Notes:

¹Contracted Studies will be billed to jurisdictions when the project is to begin.

²Contracted Planning Studies are contingent on the availability of federal funding.

³Local match from MnDOT

⁴Funding participation anticipated from NDDOT and MnDOT

⁵Increase 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.	
2018 (included use of 2014 CPG Funds)									
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
Total	\$54,900	\$21,073	\$5,015	\$199,984	\$33,028	\$114,358	\$34,353	\$52,645	\$515,357
								Total budget: \$2,556,828	
2019									
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
Total	\$16,206	\$16,998	\$4,084	\$134,224	\$2,466	\$38,629	\$66,213	\$66,820	\$345,640
								Total budget: \$1,540,237	
2020									
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
Total	\$13,380	\$14,168	\$3,372	\$148,291	\$16,436	\$69,068	\$33,149	\$101,820	\$399,684
								Total budget: \$1,736,367.21	
2021 (proposed)									
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
Total	\$19,672	\$20,831	\$4,957	\$157,169	\$2,993	\$48,893	\$31,820	\$82,820	\$369,156
								Total budget: \$1,596,326	
2022 (proposed)									
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
Total	\$17,988	\$19,048	\$4,533	\$145,281	\$2,737	\$44,878	\$29,096	\$114,820	\$378,382
								Total budget: \$1,693,891	