

**505th Transportation Technical Committee**  
**Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments**  
**THURSDAY, February 13, 2020 – 10:00 a.m.**  
**Metro COG Conference Room**  
**AGENDA**

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| 1. Call to Order and Introductions                                |                  |
| 2. Approve the Agenda   | Action Item      |
| 3. Consider Minutes of the January 9, 2019 TTC Meeting            | Action Item      |
| 4. Public Input Opportunity                                       | Public Input     |
| 5. Fargo-Moorhead Bikeways Gap Analysis Final Report Adoption     | Action Item      |
| 6. City of Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan Adoption              | Action Item      |
| 7. Performance Measure (PM) 1 – 2020 Safety Target Adoption       | Action Item      |
| 8. Moorhead Traffic Counting Addendum with ATAC                   | Action Item      |
| 9. Veterans Boulevard Corridor Feasibility Study RFP              | Action Item      |
| 10. MATBUS Transit Development Plan Consultant Selection          | Action Item      |
| 11. 17 <sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study Consultant Selection   | Action Item      |
| 12. Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan Contract Amendment | Action Item      |
| 13. 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                                     |                  |
| 14. Additional Business   | Information Item |
| 15. Adjourn   |                  |

REMINDER: The next TTC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, March 12, 2020** in the Metro COG Conference Room at 10:00 a.m.

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.

**504th Meeting of the  
FM Metro COG Transportation Technical Committee  
Thursday, January 9, 2020 – 10:00 am  
Metro COG Conference Room**

**Members Present:**

Jonathan	Atkins	City of Moorhead Traffic Engineering
Jason	Benson	Cass County Highway Engineering
Julie	Bommelman	City of Fargo, MATBUS
Brenda	Derrig	City of Fargo Engineering (alt for Jeremy Gorden)
Shane	Finck	Clay County Engineering (alt for Justin Sorum)
Cindy	Gray	Metro COG
Robin	Huston	City of Moorhead Planning
Kyle	Litchy	Cass County Highway Eng (alt for Cass Co Planning)
Jaclynn	Maahs	Concordia College
Peyton	Mastera	City of Dilworth Administration
Aaron	Nelson	Fargo City Planning
Emma	Notermann	Clay County Planning (alt for Matthew Jacobson)
Joe	Raso	GFMEDC
Mary	Safgren	MnDOT – District 4
Russ	Sahr	City of Horace Planning
Jordan	Smith	MATBUS (alt for Lori Van Beek)
Tim	Solberg	City of West Fargo Planning
Brit	Stevens	NDSU – Transportation Manager
Mark	Wolter	Freight Representative, Midnite Express
Andrew	Wrucke	City of West Fargo Engineering
Wayne	Zacher	NDDOT – Local Government Division

**Members Absent:**

Jeremy	Gorden	City of Fargo Transportation Engineering
Kim	Lipetsky	Fargo Cass Public Health
Justin	Sorum	Clay County Engineering
Lori	Van Beek	City of Moorhead, MATBUS

**Others Present:**

Adam	Altenburg	Metro COG
Luke	Champa	Metro COG
Dan	Farnsworth	Metro COG
Michael	Johnson	NDDOT – Local Government Division
Savanna	Leach	Metro COG
Michael	Maddox	Metro COG
Jim	Mertz	Bolton & Menk
Anna	Pierce	Metro COG
Steve	Strack	Houston Engineering Inc
David	Sweeney	SRF Consulting

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 am, on January 9, 2020 by Chair Gray. A quorum was present.

**2. Approve the 504th TTC Meeting Agenda**

Chair Gray asked if there were any questions about or changes to the 504th TTC Meeting Agenda.

**Motion: Approve the 504th TTC Meeting Agenda.**  
**Ms. Bommelman moved, seconded by Ms. Huston**  
**MOTION, PASSED.**  
**Motion carried unanimously.**

**3. APPROVE December 12, 2019 TTC MEETING MINUTES**

Chair Gray asked if there were any questions about or changes to the December 12, 2019 TTC Meeting Minutes.

**Motion: Approve the December 12, 2019 TTC Minutes.**  
**Mr. Benson moved, seconded by Mr. Mastera**  
**MOTION, PASSED**  
**Motion carried unanimously.**

**\*\*Mr. Stevens joined the meeting at 10:03 a.m.**

**4. Public Comment Opportunity**

No public comments were made or received.

**\*\*Mr. Solberg and Mr. Wrucke joined the meeting at 10:06 a.m.**

**\*\*Ms. Safgren joined the meeting at 10:30 a.m.**

**5. Urban Regional and Urban Roads Program Solicitation**

Mr. Champa presented the Urban Regional and Urban Roads Program Solicitation.

Urban Regional Highway System: One project submission received.  
19<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. \$11,040,000 Federal/\$2,760,000 local.

Urban Roads Program: four project submissions received. The preliminary prioritization based on the MTP were presented as follows:

1. Capital Bus Purchase - \$1,000,000 Federal/\$250,000 local
2. 32<sup>nd</sup> Avenue S Reconstruction - \$7,680,000 Federal/\$1,920,000 local
3. 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue S Interchange- \$14,600,000 Federal/\$3,650,000 local
4. Sheyenne Street Reconstruction - \$9,600,000 Federal/\$2,400,000 local

Mr. Champa discussed the basis of Metro COG's suggested prioritization, which was based on the goals of the recently adopted MTP combined with the scoring of new and expanded roadway network projects. The MTP places priority on preventative maintenance projects. Mr. Champa also explained that the application for the Sheyenne Street project was submitted for a four-lane

roadway, whereas the MTP describes this project as a three-lane roadway. This discrepancy was brought to West Fargo's attention, and the City was in the process of making a decision on how to proceed. The three-lane section was agreed upon during project prioritization based on projected 2045 ADT volumes for the segment of Sheyenne Street between 40<sup>th</sup> and 52<sup>nd</sup> Avenues. After further discussion, no changes were made to the suggested prioritization.

**Motion: Requested Action: Recommend approval to the Policy Board of the prioritized list of projects, as prioritized by the TTC, for the NDDOT Urban Roads Program and Urban Regional Highway Systems Program solicitations and subsequent submittal of proper project application materials to the NDDOT by the January 31, 2020 deadline.**

**Mr. Solberg moved, seconded by Mr. Sahr**

**MOTION, PASSED. 21-0**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **6. Urban Grant Program Solicitation**

Mr. Champa presented the Urban Grant Program Solicitation.

Urban Grant Program: one project submission was received.

1. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Pedestrian Bridge - \$2,700,000 Federal/\$700,000 local

Mr. Champa noted that Mr. Nelson had asked for opportunity to further update the application with more current graphics about the proposed pedestrian bridge. Metro COG will wait for the revised application before submitting to NDDOT.

**Motion: Recommend approval to the Policy Board of the 2nd Street bicycle and pedestrian bridge project for the NDDOT Urban Grant Program solicitation and subsequent submittal of proper project application materials to the NDDOT by the January 31, 2020 deadline.**

**Mr. Nelson moved, seconded by Mr. Solberg**

**MOTION, PASSED. 21-0**

**Motion carried unanimously.**

#### **7. Limited English Proficiency Plan (agenda item 7), Title VI and Non-Discrimination Plan Update (agenda item 8)**

Ms. Gray noted that items 7 and 8 have been combined on the agenda, but are still considered separate, as they need separate actions. She stated that in the July of 2019, NDDOT completed a Title VI audit of Metro COG. In August, Metro COG received a letter outlining several recommendations and corrective actions that were needed to bring our Title VI and LEP documents into compliance with Federal rules. After consulting with NDDOT about the best way to proceed, Metro COG determined that it made sense to update our Title VI and LEP documents for 2020, since both plans were due to be fully updated in 2020.

Ms. Pierce further described some of the updates that were needed to both documents both in response to the audit, and simply because they needed updating. Ms. Gray explained actions Metro COG has already taken in response

to the audit, and showed photos of Metro COG's display of Title VI and LEP information and complaint forms both in the office and in the hallway, out of sight from the front desk, as directed by the audit.

Ms. Gray explained that the LEP Plan is an appendix of the Title VI Plan, so Metro COG was asking for a recommendation of that first, from a procedural perspective. She also stated that NDDOT will be completing their review of the documents in the near future, so the recommended motion states that a recommendation for approval is contingent upon edits needed as a result of NDDOT's review.

Mr. Atkins noted that in the preparation of Moorhead's ADA Transition Plan, the City of Moorhead learned that a specific coordinator must be named, and not just identified as a position. Ms. Gray indicated that Metro COG could make that addition in case it is also required for Title VI and LEP. Mr. Johnson also stated that the NDDOT is going through a review and update of their respective plans as well, and new documents and forms will be placed on their website and could serve as a reference.

***Motion: [Agenda Item 7] Recommend approval of the Limited English Proficiency Plan and the Title VI and Non-Discrimination Plan to the Policy Board, with the addition of a specific name as the coordinator, and contingent upon edits needed as a result of NDDOT's review.***

***Mr. Sahr moved, seconded by Mr. Atkins.***

***MOTION, PASSED. 21-0***

***Motion carried unanimously.***

## **8. 2020 Title VI Plan Update**

**(combined with Agenda Item 7)**

## **9. Agency Updates**

City of Fargo: 64<sup>th</sup> Avenue infrastructure updates summer 2020. Core Neighborhoods Plan kickoff February 2020.

City of Moorhead: 21<sup>st</sup> Underpass construction continues, 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Mill & Overlay plan finalization is underway in preparation for 2020 construction. Comprehensive Plan kickoff meeting next Friday.

City of West Fargo: finishing up CIP for 2021, no major updates.

Dilworth: no updates

City of Horace: engineers working on preliminary plans for update of Wall Street/88<sup>th</sup> St to the proposed Diversion boundaries.

Cass County: CR10 project Casselton to Mapleton coming up in 2020. Continued search for new County Planner. Finalizing plans with consultant for Subdivision Ordinance.

Clay County: no updates

NDDOT: Michael Johnson indicated that this will be his last TTC meeting, Wayne Zacher will be taking over the MPO liaison role for NDDOT. Based on what NDDOT has heard, a new staff person from FHWA will be attending the TTC meetings moving forward.

GFMEDC: Mr. Raso stated that the EDC is excited about the Cass County Commission meeting at which the Commission approved support of the Workforce Academy. The EDC is working with national consultant on certification of "Shovel-Ready" business sites in the area.

Metro COG: Veterans Blvd Corridor Study RFP in works. Ms. Gray stated that she will be initiating work on the 2021-2022 UPWP in order to have 2021 budget numbers ready for local jurisdictions this spring. Local jurisdictions were encouraged to think about plans and studies that will be important to them in the next few years. The 2021-2025 TDP RFP was released Tuesday. The Moorhead 17<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Study RFP was released last week. Metro COG will participate in Regional LiDAR Collection consultant interviews.

**10. Additional Business**

No additional business.

**11. Adjourn**

The 504th Regular Meeting of the TTC was adjourned on January 9, 2020 at 11:39 a.m.

**THE NEXT FM METRO COG TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING WILL BE HELD February 13, 2020, 10:00 A.M. AT THE METRO COG CONFERENCE ROOM (1 – 2<sup>ND</sup> ST N, CASE PLAZA 232, FARGO, ND).**

Respectfully Submitted,

Savanna Leach  
Executive Assistant



Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan  
Council of Governments

Case Plaza Suite 232 | One 2nd Street North  
Fargo, North Dakota 58102-4807  
p: 701.532.5100 | f: 701.232.5043  
e: metrocog@fmmetrocog.org  
www.fmmetrocog.org

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Dan Farnsworth  
**Date:** February 7, 2020  
**Re:** **Fargo-Moorhead Bikeways Gap Analysis Final Report Adoption**

In December 2018, Metro COG in cooperation with the jurisdictions of West Fargo, Fargo, Moorhead, and Clay County, kicked-off the Fargo-Moorhead Bikeway Gap Analysis. Metro COG contracted with Toole Design (prime consultant) and Bolton & Menk (subconsultant) to lead the study.

This study looks at 16 key bikeway gaps in the Fargo-Moorhead Metro Area, most of which were originally identified during the development of the 2016 Fargo-Moorhead Metro Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan. These gaps included three in West Fargo, seven in Fargo, two in Moorhead, one Red River crossing, and three in Moorhead/Clay County.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the 16 bikeway gaps by obtaining public input, review the existing conditions and local needs, and develop alternatives, planning level cost estimates, and implementation strategies for the gaps. The Plan was guided by a 14-member Study Review Committee and had extensive public involvement.

The final report was completed in December 2019 and can be viewed and downloaded at the following link:

<http://www.fmmetrocog.org/projects-rfps/FM-bike-gap>

At their meeting on January 29<sup>th</sup>, the Bicycle & Pedestrian Committee recommended adoption of the Final Report.

**Requested Action:**

**Recommend Policy Board adoption of the Fargo-Moorhead Bikeways Gap Analysis Final Report.**



**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Dan Farnsworth & Anna Pierce  
**Date:** February 6, 2020  
**Re:** **City of Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan Adoption**

In November of 2018, Metro COG, in cooperation with the City of Fargo, commenced the Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan. Key stakeholders involved in the Plan's process included Metro COG, the City of Fargo, Fargo Public Schools, West Fargo Public Schools, and representatives from the private schools. Metro COG contracted with consulting firms Alta Planning + Design (with subconsultant KLJ) to carry out the study and complete the Plan.

Included in this Plan are all elementary and middle schools located within the City of Fargo (plus Liberty Middle School in the City of West Fargo). In total, 31 K-8 schools are included – all twenty Fargo public schools, five West Fargo public schools, and six private schools.

The purpose of the Plan is to provide information, resources, and recommendations to elected officials, City and school staff, and parents to make walking and bicycling safer and more inviting for students traveling to and from school. This Plan incorporates the "Six E's" of Safe Routes to School: Education, Encouragement, Engineering, Enforcement, Evaluation, and Equity.

As part of this Plan's process, in-person community engagement was conducted, 495 student teacher tallies were completed, 1,421 parent caregiver surveys were received, and school arrival and dismissals were observed at each of the 31 schools.

The last Safe Routes to School Plan done for the City of Fargo was completed in 2009. With extensive growth in the city and school district since 2009, which included the addition of new K-8 schools, a revised Plan was much-needed. This Plan provides a fresh update and incorporates the latest standards and best practices for safe routes to school.

Upon adoption by the City of Fargo and Metro COG Policy Board, the Plan will become publicly available for use by elected officials, City and school staff, and parents.

The final draft Plan can be found at the following link:

<https://altaplanning.egnyte.com/dl/ljGezkbZmD>

The final draft Plan's Appendices can be found at the following link:

<https://altaplanning.egnyte.com/dl/UZDzBNnDqH>

**Requested Action:**

**Recommend to the Policy Board adoption of the City of Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan and approval of the Resolution of Adoption for the City of Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan.**



## RESOLUTION OF ADOPTION – 2020-R005

### City of Fargo Safe Routes to School Plan

**WHEREAS**, The Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments (Metro COG), is the Metropolitan Planning Organization designated by the Governors of North Dakota and Minnesota to maintain the metropolitan area's transportation planning process in accordance with federal regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, The 2015 federal transportation bill, the *Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act* (FAST Act) created a set-aside of Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) program funding for transportation alternatives (TA) funds, which include small-scale transportation improvement projects, such as safe routes to school projects; and

**WHEREAS**, Metro COG received approval from its Transportation Technical Committee and Policy Board to pursue a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan for the City of Fargo in 2018 for the sake of maximizing the health and safety of school children in the City of Fargo; and

**WHEREAS**, Metro COG formed a study review committee consisting of representation from the Fargo Public School District, the City of Fargo, the Fargo Police Department, West Fargo Public School District, Fargo Park District, as well as Oak Grove Lutheran Schools, Saint John Paul II Catholic School Network, and Grace Lutheran School to oversee the SRTS Plan development; and

**WHEREAS**, The City of Fargo SRTS Plan developed infrastructure and non-infrastructure opportunities for improvement to assist and guide the School Districts and City in its pursuit of enhancing and increasing opportunities to safely and regularly walk and bicycle to elementary and middle schools in the city limits of Fargo; and

**WHEREAS**, The City of Fargo SRTS Plan establishes a foundation for the pursuit of Federal grant monies through the North Dakota Department of Transportation as well as for future coordinated SRTS planning efforts in the City of Fargo; and

**WHEREAS**, The adopted City of Fargo SRTS Plan will satisfy, enhance, and serve as a basis for justifying the application for any funding requests by eligible agencies to move forward with coordinated SRTS activities or programs; and

**WHEREAS**, The approved City of Fargo SRTS Plan may be considered a minimum qualification for inclusion of Federal funding aimed at implementation of activities outlined in the Plan for inclusion in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that Metro COG does hereby adopt the City of Fargo SRTS Plan, and agrees to use it as a tool to implement its recommendations to enhance the health and safety of Fargo's school children and complement the overall development of the metropolitan transportation system.

Metro COG Policy Board Chair \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Metro COG Executive Director \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Anna Pierce  
**Date:** February 7, 2020  
**Re:** **Performance Measure 1 (PM1) – 2020 Safety Target Adoption**

As a part of the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, which was signed into law on December 4, 2015, State DOTs and MPOs are required to establish quantifiable targets for performance measures. There are three performance measures, covering the areas of safety, pavement and bridge condition, and travel reliability.

Performance Measure 1 (PM1) is meant to establish performance targets related to safety. This falls under §490 Subpart B. As such, each state must annually establish and report performance targets for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) for the following five (5) safety performance measures:

1. Number of Fatalities
2. Rate of Fatalities
3. Number of Serious Injuries
4. Rate of Serious Injuries
5. Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Non-motorized Serious Injuries

As an MPO, Metro COG is required by FHWA to either

1. Agree to program projects in each state's portion of the Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) to support the performance targets established by the respective state and/or
2. Establish MPO specific safety performance targets for all or some of the above five measures.

These are reviewed and revised annually. 2020 is the third year we are reviewing and adopting PM1 targets for the MPA.

In 2018 and 2019, TTC recommended to Policy Board to adopt MnDOT and NDDOT's Safety Performance Measures for each portion of the MPA. Based on the crash data available to us, **Metro COG again requests that TTC recommend adoption of MnDOT and NDDOT's Safety Performance Measures for each portion of the MPA.** This information is based on the following analysis and timeframe.

In December 2019, FHWA determined whether a State has met or made significant progress toward meeting 2014-2018 HSIP targets. FHWA used 2012-2016 data as a baseline period for assessing significant progress. In March 2020, FHWA will report their findings to States indicating whether the State has met or made significant progress towards meeting their 2014-2018 HSIP targets.

FHWA uses the following table to determine if a State has met or made significant progress towards their 2018 Performance Measure 1 Targets (received from

[https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/spm/pm\\_progress\\_fs.cfm](https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/spm/pm_progress_fs.cfm)).

**Example Significant Progress Determination for CY 2018 Targets**

Performance Measure	5-year Rolling Averages			Target Achieved?	Better than Baseline?	Met or Made Significant Progress?
	TARGET 2014 – 2018 <sup>A</sup>	ACTUAL 2014– 2018 <sup>B</sup>	BASELINE 2012– 2016 <sup>C</sup>			
Number of Fatalities	465	472.4	474	No	✓ Yes	<b>Yes</b> (4 out of 5 targets met or made significant progress)
Fatality Rate	0.980	0.990	0.988	No	No	
Number of Serious Injuries	2,560.0	2,578.4	2,703.2	No	✓ Yes	
Serious Injury Rate	4.126	4.214	4.288	No	✓ Yes	
Number of Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	108.0	107.6	113.2	✓ Yes	N/A	

(A) CY 2018 Targets are established and reported in the August 31, 2017 HSIP Annual Report.

(B) Actual performance is the 5-year rolling average ending in the year for which the targets were established. In this case that is CY 2014-2018.

(C) Baseline performance is the 5-year rolling average that ends prior to the year in which the targets were established. In this case, that is CY 2012-2016, since the targets were established in 2017. Baseline performance is calculated in order to compare whether the actual outcome for CY 2014-2018 was better than the baseline performance (in this case CY 2012-2016), for the targets that were not met.

By June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2020 States that did not meet or make significant progress toward meeting 2014-2018 HSIP targets must submit an HSIP Implementation Plan to FHWA. If a State did not meet or make significant progress toward meeting their 2014-2018 HSIP targets, the State must:

1. Use obligation authority equal to the Fiscal Year 2017 HSIP apportionment only for highway safety improvement projects for October 1, 2020 through September 30, 2021.
2. Develop and submit an HSIP Implementation Plan that describes actions the State will take to meet or make significant progress toward meeting its targets.

Then in December 2020, FHWA will start the process over again and determine whether a State has met or made significant progress toward meeting 2015-2019 HSIP targets. FHWA uses 2013-2017 data as a baseline period for assessing significant progress for this reporting period.

To compare and determine how Metro COG's metropolitan planning area (MPA) contributes to each state's targets, staff has compiled Assessment Tables for PM1 targets for the years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for each state's portion of the MPA (**see Attachments 1 and 2**). The 2020 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment Tables for both NDDOT's and MnDOT's portion of the MPA have been supplemented with numbers that illustrate a threshold of fatalities and serious injuries that, if exceeded in 2020, would cause the MPO to exceed the proportion of fatalities and serious injuries that are relative (i.e. proportional) to our region based on population. In a worst case scenario, where the numbers shown are exceeded, the MPO area would have a disproportionately high number of serious injuries and fatalities relative to the state overall.

Within the Assessment Tables, staff have compared the rate of fatalities and the rate of serious injuries to the state targets. These rates are consistently calculated statewide and within the MPA, and are based on per 100million Vehicle Miles Travelled.

In order to compare the MPO target (portion of the data for the MPA within the state in which the targets are adopted) to the statewide target for the number of fatalities, number of serious injuries, and number of non-motorized fatalities/number of non-motorized serious injuries, MPO staff needed to determine a common factor to compare the data against. It's important to note that FHWA does not illustrate what this common factor is. Therefore, Metro COG staff determined that the best, most reliable common factor would be population.

The **Estimated Populations table** below illustrates the statewide population, jurisdictions within the MPO within that state, a summary of the jurisdictional total population within the MPO, the county population within the that state, and the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) population. Note that the Census Bureau doesn't collect population for the MPA; instead it collects it based on the MSA. The Fargo-Moorhead MSA includes all of Cass County, ND and Clay County, MN.

### Minnesota Estimated Populations - Based on the ACS 5-year 2014-2018

	Population	% of State Population	% of MSA Population
<b>Minnesota</b>	5,527,358	100%	N/A
Moorhead, MN	42,395	0.77%	17.89%
Dilworth, MN	4,370	0.08%	1.84%
<b>Member Jurisdiction Total</b>	46,765	0.85%	19.73%
<b>Clay County, MN</b>	62,801	1.14%	26.50%
F-M MSA	237,003	N/A	100%

### North Dakota Estimated Populations - Based on the ACS 5-year 2014-2018

	Population	% of State Population	% of MSA Population
<b>North Dakota</b>	752,201	100%	N/A
Fargo, ND	120,209	15.98%	50.72%
West Fargo, ND	34,419	4.58%	14.52%
Horace, ND	2,660	0.35%	1.12%
<b>Member Jurisdiction Total</b>	157,288	20.91%	66.36%
<b>Cass County, ND</b>	174,202	23.16%	73.50%
F-M MSA	237,003	N/A	100%

Take note that in Minnesota the **Member Jurisdictional total percentage is 0.85%** of the statewide population and the **Clay County population total is 1.14%** of the statewide population. In North Dakota the **Member Jurisdictional total percentage is 20.91%** of the statewide population and the **Cass County population total is 23.16%** of the statewide population. These are the population percentages that staff compared to the percentages listed in grey and parentheses in the 'MPO YYYY-YYYY Actual Performance\*' column in the assessment tables.

In each Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment table, the MPO Actual Performance column lists the actual 5-year rolling average number for each category (in black) and

the percent of the total Statewide target number in that category (in grey). The percent of the Statewide target number is then compared to the relevant local MPA percent of the State Population.

For example:

The 2018 PM1 Target Assessment – NDDOT table states that the Number of Fatalities for 2018 is 138 statewide, which is assessed based on a 5-year rolling average of 2014-2018 statewide data.

The MPO 2014-2018 actual performance for the North Dakota portion of the MPA was 5.8, which is **4.2%** of the total 138 target.

The Member Jurisdiction total population is **20.91%** of the statewide population and Cass County's population is **23.16%** of the statewide population.

When compared to either the Member Jurisdiction population or Cass County population percentages, 4.2% is still significantly lower.

Therefore, the MPO is achieving (i.e. supporting and facilitating) the Statewide Target, as adopted in 2018.

*If the 5-year rolling average Number of Fatalities within the North Dakota portion of the MPA was greater than 28.9, then the MPO would be concerned and staff would consider that the MPO is not meeting the statewide target, as 28.9 is 20.94% of the total target and 20.94% is greater than 20.91%.*

Based on the Target Assessment tables for each state that indicate that the Fargo-Moorhead MPO is meeting or making significant progress towards the targets previously adopted, Metro COG requests the TTC recommend the Policy Board approve the attached resolutions for each state that are in support of adopting the statewide Performance Measure 1 – Safety targets, as these targets are in line with the actual performance data.

Once approved by the Policy Board, the resolutions will be signed and distributed to the applicable jurisdictions and programming will occur in accordance.

**Requested Actions:**

Metro COG requests a favorable recommendation to Policy Board to adopt MnDOT's 2020 Safety Performance Measures by signing the enclosed MnDOT resolution.

Metro COG requests a favorable recommendation to Policy Board to adopt NDDOT's 2020 Safety Performance Measures by signing the enclosed NDDOT resolution.

## Estimated Populations - Based on the ACS 5-year 2014-2018

	Population	% of State Population	% of MSA Population
<b>North Dakota</b>	752,201	100%	N/A
Fargo, ND	120,209	15.98%	50.72%
West Fargo, ND	34,419	4.58%	14.52%
Horace, ND	2,660	0.35%	1.12%
<b>Member Jurisdiction Total</b>	157,288	20.91%	66.36%
<b>Cass County, ND</b>	174,202	23.16%	73.50%
F-M MSA	237,003	N/A	100%

## 2018 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment - NDDOT

2014-2018 Assessment Table

	5-Year Rolling Averages			Assessment		
	MPO 2012-2016 Baseline Performance	Statewide 2014-2018 Targets <small>Evaluated based on 5yr Rolling average</small>	MPO 2014-2018 Actual Performance* <small>(ND portion of MPA)</small>	Statewide Target Achieved? <small>Compares to state goal</small>	Better than baseline	Met or Made Significant Progress
Number of Fatalities	4.2	138	5.8 (4.20%)	Yes	No	Yes
Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)	0.199	1.366	0.249	Yes	No	
Number of Serious Injuries	41.6	516	40.4 (7.83%)	Yes	Yes	
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)	1.985	5.088	1.765	Yes	Yes	
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities & Non-motorized Serious Injuries	3.60	34.8	4.0 (11.49%)	Yes	No	

\*Percentages next to MPO Actual Performance as based on portion of Statewide Target for which the F-M MPA was responsible.

# 2019 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment - NDDOT

2015-2019 Assessment Table

	5-Year Rolling Averages			Assessment		
	MPO 2013-2017 Baseline Performance	Statewide 2015-2019 Targets <small>Evaluated based on 5yr Rolling average</small>	MPO 2015-2019 Actual Performance* <small>(ND portion of MPA)</small>	Statewide Target Achieved? <small>Compares to state goal</small>	Better than baseline	Met or Made Significant Progress
Number of Fatalities	4.4	127.3	5.8 (4.56%)	Yes	No	Yes
Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)	0.195	1.271	0.238	Yes	Yes	
Number of Serious Injuries	39.8	486.2	39.4 (8.10%)	Yes	Yes	
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)	1.819	4.848	1.623	Yes	Yes	
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities & Non-motorized Serious Injuries	4.40	34.6	5.4 (15.61%)	Yes	No	

\*Percentages next to MPO Actual Performance as based on portion of Statewide Target for which the F-M MPA was responsible.



# 2020 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment - NDDOT

2016-2020 Assessment Table

	5-Year Rolling Averages			Assessment		
	MPO 2014-2018 Baseline Performance	2016-2020 Targets Evaluated based on 5yr Rolling average (2016- 2020)	MPO 2016-2020 Actual Performance* (ND portion of MPA)	Target Achieved? Compares to state goal	Better than baseline	Met or Made Significant Progress
Number of Fatalities	5.8	108.3	<b>22.6</b> (84 fatalities this year)			
Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)	0.249	1.106				
Number of Serious Injuries	40.4	413.9	<b>86.5</b> (230 serious injuries this year)			
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)	1.765	4.230				
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities & Non-motorized Serious Injuries	3.60	33.4	<b>6.9</b> (16.9 non- motorized fatalities/serious injuries this year)			

\*Numbers listed in the MPO Actual Performance column for 2016-2020 represent the highest threshold that would still meet each of the MPO's North Dakota targets. If exceeded, the 5-year rolling averages would exceed the MPA's proportion of the statewide targets. The bolded numbers represent what the 5-year rolling average would have to be for the portion of the F-M MPA within the state of North Dakota and the information in parentheses is what would have to occur in 2020 for that 5-year rolling average to occur.

## Estimated Populations - Based on the ACS 5-year 2014-2018

	Population	% of State Population	% of MSA Population
<b>Minnesota</b>	5,527,358	100%	N/A
Moorhead, MN	42,395	0.77%	17.89%
Dilworth, MN	4,370	0.08%	1.84%
<b>Member Jurisdiction Total</b>	46,765	0.85%	19.73%
<b>Clay County, MN</b>	62,801	1.14%	26.50%
F-M MSA	237,003	N/A	100%

## 2018 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment - MnDOT

2014-2018 Assessment Table

	5-Year Rolling Averages			Assessment		
	MPO 2012-2016 Baseline Performance	Statewide 2014-2018 Targets <small>Evaluated based on 5yr Rolling average</small>	MPO 2014-2018 Actual Performance* <small>(MN portion of MPA)</small>	Statewide Target Achieved? <small>Compares to state goal</small>	Better than baseline	Met or Made Significant Progress
Number of Fatalities	2.4	375	2.0 (0.53%)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)	0.280	0.620	0.211	Yes	Yes	
Number of Serious Injuries	11.2	1935	9.0 (0.47%)	Yes	Yes	
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)	1.266	3.149	0.961	Yes	Yes	
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities & Non-motorized Serious Injuries	0.40	348	0.4 (0.11%)	Yes	No	

\*Percentages next to MPO Actual Performance as based on portion of Statewide Target for which the F-M MPA was responsible.

# 2019 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment - MnDOT

2015-2019 Assessment Table

	5-Year Rolling Averages			Assessment		
	MPO 2013-2017 Baseline Performance	Statewide 2015-2019 Targets <small>Evaluated based on 5yr Rolling average</small>	MPO 2015-2019 Actual Performance* <small>(MN portion of MPA)</small>	Statewide Target Achieved? <small>Compares to state goal</small>	Better than baseline	Met or Made Significant Progress
Number of Fatalities	2.4	372.2	1.6 (0.43%)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)	0.272	0.622	0.165	Yes	Yes	
Number of Serious Injuries	10.4	1,711	8.6 (0.50%)	Yes	Yes	
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)	1.147	2.854	0.889	Yes	Yes	
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities & Non-motorized Serious Injuries	0.60	267.5	0.4 (0.15%)	Yes	Yes	

\*Percentages next to MPO Actual Performance as based on portion of Statewide Target for which the F-M MPA was responsible.

# 2020 Performance Measure 1 Target Assessment - MnDOT

2016-2020 Assessment Table

	5-Year Rolling Averages			Assessment		
	MPO 2012-2016 Baseline Performance	Statewide 2016-2020 Targets <small>Evaluated based on 5yr Rolling average</small>	MPO 2016-2020 Actual Performance* <small>(MN portion of MPA)</small>	Statewide Target Achieved? <small>Compares to state goal</small>	Better than baseline	Met or Made Significant Progress
Number of Fatalities	2.4	375.4	<b>3.2</b> (4 fatalities this year)			
Rate of Fatalities (per 100M VMT)	0.280	0.626				
Number of Serious Injuries	11.2	1,714.2	<b>14.6</b> (17 serious injuries this year)			
Rate of Serious Injuries (per 100M VMT)	1.266	2.854				
Number of Non- motorized Fatalities & Non-motorized Serious Injuries	0.40	317.0	<b>2.7</b> (12 non- motorized fatalities/serious injuries this year)			

\*Numbers listed in the MPO Actual Performance column for 2016-2020 represent the highest threshold that would still meet each of the MPO's Minnesota targets. If exceeded, the 5-year rolling averages would exceed the MPA's proportion of the statewide targets. The bolded numbers represent what the 5-year rolling average would have to be for the portion of the F-M MPA within the state of Minnesota and the information in parentheses is what would have to occur in 2020 for that 5-year rolling average to occur.

RESOLUTION 2020-R003  
OF THE FARGO-MOORHEAD  
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Adopting HSIP Performance Targets

**Whereas**, the U.S. Department of Transportation established five performance measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) as detailed in 23 CFR 490, Subpart B, National Performance Measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program;

**Whereas**, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) established performance targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures in accordance with 23 CFR 490.209; and

**Whereas**, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must establish performance targets for each of the HSIP performance measures; and

**Whereas**, MPOs establish HSIP targets by either agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP target or commit to a quantifiable HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area; and

**Now, therefore, be it resolved**, that the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments agrees to plan and program projects so that the projects contribute to the accomplishment of MnDOT's calendar year 2020 HSIP targets for the following performance measures:

Number of fatalities: 375.4;  
Rate of fatalities: 0.626 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled;  
Number of serious injuries: 1,714.2;  
Rate of serious injuries: 2.854 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled; and,  
Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries: 317.0.

Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

---

Brad Olson, Metro COG Policy Board Chair

---

Cynthia R Gray, Metro COG Executive Director

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

RESOLUTION 2020-R004  
OF THE FARGO-MOORHEAD  
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Adopting HSIP Performance Targets

*Whereas*, the U.S. Department of Transportation established five performance measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) as detailed in 23 CFR 490, Subpart B, National Performance Measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program;

*Whereas*, the North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDDOT) established performance targets for each of the five HSIP performance measures in accordance with 23 CFR 490.209; and

*Whereas*, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must establish performance targets for each of the HSIP performance measures; and

*Whereas*, MPOs establish HSIP targets by either agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute to the accomplishment of the State DOT HSIP target or commit to a quantifiable HSIP target for the metropolitan planning area; and

*Now, therefore, be it resolved*, that the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments agrees to plan and program projects so that the projects contribute to the accomplishment of NDDOT's calendar year 2020 HSIP targets for the following performance measures:

Number of fatalities: 108.3;  
Rate of fatalities: 1.106 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled;  
Number of serious injuries: 413.9;  
Rate of serious injuries: 4.230 per 100 million vehicle miles traveled; and,  
Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries: 33.4.

Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments

---

Brad Olson, Metro COG Policy Board Chair

---

Cynthia R Gray, Metro COG Executive Director

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Cindy Gray, Executive Director  
**Date:** February 6, 2020  
**Re:** **Moorhead Traffic Counting Addendum with ATAC**

The attached scope of work and contract addendum between Metro COG and ATAC will initiate the first year of what is envisioned as a 3-5 year program of conducting traffic counts at intersections in Moorhead (to be carried out by Moorhead and Metro COG), followed by processing of those counts by ATAC.

Once processed, the count data will be provided to the City and Metro COG. Additionally, ATAC will use the count data, combined with updated geometric data to be provided by the City, to update the City's Synchro Traffic Model. Once updated, the City and ATAC will collaborate to complete a signal timing update and Synchro model optimization.

The scope of work, timeline, and budget are outlined in Attachments 1 and 2.

This project was included in the 2020 UPWP as part of Amendment #5 to the 2019-2020 UPWP. The proposed cost is \$12,215.00 which will be paid for by Metro COG (80%) and the City of Moorhead (20%).

**Requested Action: Recommend approval of the ATAC Addendum #4 to the Master Agreement with Metro COG and the proposed Scope of Work.**

# North Dakota MPO Planning Support Program Master Agreement

## *Fargo Moorhead Metro COG Addendum #4 to the Master Agreement*

Upon execution by the parties below, this Addendum and any attachments shall become attached to and incorporated into the 'North Dakota MPO Planning Support Program Master Agreement' between 'Fargo Moorhead Metro COG ' and North Dakota State University.

1. *Project Title:* **Traffic Data Collection & Signal Timing Optimization for City of Moorhead**
2. *Effective Dates:* **March 2, 2020 through February 26, 2021**
3. *Statement of Work:* UGPTI will assist the City of Moorhead in their 2020 traffic data collection as well as 2021 traffic signal retiming/optimization, progression design, and Synchro traffic model updates.
4. *Principal Investigator:* Kshitij Sharma
5. *Desired Deliverables:*
  1. Updated base Synchro traffic model  
UGPTI will provide the COG and the City of Moorhead with an updated base Synchro traffic model
  2. Optimized base Synchro traffic model  
UGPTI will provide the COG and the City of Moorhead with an optimized base Synchro traffic model.
  3. Raw Counts to the City of Moorhead and FM Metro COG after the data collection task.
6. *Contract Amount:* \$ 12,215

### AUTHORIZATION:

#### Fargo Moorhead Metro COG

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized                      Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name and Title                      Date

#### North Dakota State University

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized                      Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name and Title                      Date



**BUDGET:**

**Project Title: Traffic Data Collection & Signal  
Timing Optimization for City of Moorhead**

<b>Cost Item</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Staff Salaries	\$ 1,765
Benefits	\$ 724
Grad Student Salaries	\$ -
Undergrad Student Salaries	\$ 5,753
Benefits	\$ 288
Operating	\$ -
Total direct costs	\$ 8,530
NDSU overhead (43.2%)	\$ 3,685
<b>Total project cost</b>	<b>\$ 12,215</b>

To: Cindy Gray, FM Metro COG

From: Bradley Wentz, UGPTI/ATAC

**Re: FM #4 Traffic Data Collection & Signal Timing Optimization for City of Moorhead.**

Date: February 6, 2020

**Background/Purpose**

Within the FM Metro COG, the City of Moorhead faces challenges common to almost all transportation jurisdictions. The challenges include dearth of resources in terms of full time equivalents required for optimal operations, planning, and safety as the time of traffic engineer and traffic signal technician at the City is only partly spent on traffic data collection and traffic model updates. The purpose of this project is to assist the City in their planned yearly traffic data collection as well as to initiate the 3-5 year traffic signal retiming/ optimization, progression design, and Synchro traffic model updates. This effort will inform the City's planning efforts and as a result provide the traveling public with streamlined operations and increased safety. This project consists of the first year of data collection and Synchro updates.

**Project Tasks**

This pilot project requires symbiotic participation from the City's Traffic Engineering staff. Eighteen of the signalized intersections within and immediately next to the City limits are to be included. UGPTI has outlined the project tasks as follows:

1. Field Data Collection (City)  
The associated City staff will collect field data such as geometrics, lane assignments, storage-bay lengths, detector lengths and locations etc.
2. Video Data Recording (City and FM Metro COG)  
The associated City staff will record traffic solely for turning movement count purposes for 2 hours each during the AM-, Midday-, and PM-peak periods.
3. TMC Data Collection (UGPTI)  
UGPTI staff will count traffic from the videos recorded by the City and FM Metro COG. The data will be collected in per lane format instead of the conventional per lane-group format, which will help in the simulation model calibration. This data is to be provided to the City of Moorhead in Petra Pro format.
4. Synchro Model Update (UGPTI)  
UGPTI staff will enter the data collected from tasks 1 through 3 into the base Synchro traffic model provided by the City.
5. Signal Timing Update (City & UGPTI)

The associated City staff, with assistance from UGPTI, will update the Signal Timing in the updated Synchro model

6. Synchro Model Optimization (UGPTI & City)  
UGPTI staff, with assistance from City will then run the up-to-date SimTraffic model for optimization purposes ensuring that it conforms to local existing conditions.

### Major Milestones and Deadlines

The major milestones for this project and their deadlines are:

Milestone	Deadline
Kick-off	March 2, 2020
Video Data Recording	April 17, 2020
Field Data Collection	August 28, 2020
TMC Data Collection	October 31, 2020
Synchro Model Update	December 11, 2020
Signal Timing Update	January 15, 2021
Synchro Model Optimization	February 26, 2021

### Resources Required

UGPTI would require the following:

- Assistance from the City of Moorhead's Traffic Engineering department in providing:
  - Field data
  - Video data
  - List of intersections
  - Base Synchro traffic model(s)
  - Clearance interval worksheets
  - Traffic signal controller data
  - 2020 aerial imagery data
  - 2020 planned project information
  - Other data as requested

### Deliverables

Deliverables in this project will consist of the following:

- Updated base Synchro traffic model  
UGPTI will provide the COG and the City of Moorhead with an updated base Synchro traffic model
- Optimized base Synchro traffic model  
UGPTI will provide the COG and the City of Moorhead with an optimized base Synchro traffic model.
- Raw Counts to the City of Moorhead after the data collection task.



**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Dan Farnsworth  
**Date:** February 7, 2020  
**Re:** **Veterans Boulevard Corridor Extension Study RFP**

Metro COG, in cooperation with the cities of Fargo and Horace, has developed a request for proposals (RFP) seeking qualified consulting firms for the Veterans Boulevard Corridor Extension Study.

As the Fargo-Moorhead Metro Area continues to rapidly grow in the southwest area, an extension of Veterans Boulevard may be advantageous to provide access and connectivity and to alleviate future traffic on parallel corridors such as CR 17 / Sheyenne St.

This study will analyze alternatives and look at the feasibility of extending Veterans Blvd from 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S to 100<sup>th</sup> Ave S. and will also look at future implications of such an extension to the segment from 40<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S. While this study will be studying Veterans Blvd from 40<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 100<sup>th</sup> Ave S, emphasis will be given on the section from 40<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S.

In addition, the travel demand model will be utilized to assess the impacts of a Veterans Blvd extension (or non-extension) on Sheyenne St / CR 17, particularly from 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue S to 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue S. Metro COG intends to use ADT volumes projections from this study to compare with those of past studies. Our staff will carry out this review, in coordination with local partners, particularly the Cities of West Fargo, Horace and Cass County, for the purpose of preparing a technical memo that documents agreed-upon 2045 capacity needs for Sheyenne Street south of 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue S.

Initially, the study was programmed to have an overall budget of \$150,000, but Metro COG is anticipating an additional \$30,000 will be added to the study, bringing the overall study budget to \$180,000. With an overall budget of \$180,000, \$144,000 will be provided by Metro COG CPG funds and \$36,000 will be provided by local funds. The local funds will be provided by the Cities of Fargo and Horace with the exact breakdown currently being discussed.

It is important to note that due to the additional \$30,000 to be added to the study's budget, a UPWP amendment will need to be completed before entering into contract with a consultant.

**Attached** you will find the draft RFP for your review.

**Requested Action:**

**Recommend Policy Board approval of the RFP for the Veterans Boulevard Corridor Extension Study.**

FARGO-MOORHEAD  
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

PROJECT NO. 2020-217

*Veterans Boulevard Corridor Extension Study*  
***DRAFT***

*February, 2020*

APPROVED:

---

Cindy Gray  
Metro COG, Executive Director

## REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP)

The Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments (Metro COG) requests proposals from qualified consultants for the following project:

### Veterans Boulevard Corridor Extension Study

Qualifications based selection criteria will be used to analyze proposals from responding consultants. The most qualified candidates may be invited to present an oral interview. Upon completion of technical ranking and oral interviews, Metro COG will enter into negotiations with the top ranked firm. **Sealed cost proposals shall be submitted with the RFP.** The cost proposal of the top ranked firm will be opened during contract negotiations. Those firms not selected for direct negotiations will have their unopened cost proposals returned. Metro COG reserves the right to reject any or all submittals. This project will be funded, in part with federal transportation funds and has a not-to-exceed budget of **\$180,000.**

Interested firms can request a full copy of the RFP by telephoning 701.532.5100, or by e-mail: [metrococg@fmmetrococg.org](mailto:metrococg@fmmetrococg.org). Copies will be posted on the North Dakota Department of Transportation QBS website (<https://www.dot.nd.gov>) and are also available for download in .pdf format at [www.fmmetrococg.org](http://www.fmmetrococg.org).

All applicants must be prequalified with the North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDDOT). If not prequalified with the NDDOT, applicants will be required to submit a completed Standard Form 330 (Exhibit D) with their submittal of information.

All proposals received by **4:30 pm (Central Time) on Wednesday March 18, 2020** at the Metro COG office will be given equal consideration. Respondents must submit seven (7) print copies and one (1) PDF copy of the proposal. The full length of each proposal shall not exceed twenty (20) double sided pages for a total of forty (40) pages; including any supporting material, charts, or tables.

Hard copies of technical and/or cost proposals shall be shipped to ensure timely delivery to the contact defined below:

Dan Farnsworth  
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments  
Case Plaza, Suite 232  
One 2nd Street North  
Fargo, ND 58102  
[farnsworth@fmmetrococg.org](mailto:farnsworth@fmmetrococg.org)  
701-532-5106

Fax versions will not be accepted as substitutes for the hard copies. Once submitted, the proposals will become property of Metro COG.

Note: The document can be made available in alternative formats for persons with disabilities by contacting Savanna Leach, Executive Secretary at 701.532.5100 or [leach@fmmetrococg.org](mailto:leach@fmmetrococg.org).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Agency Overview .....	4
II.	Background Information .....	4
III.	Project Objective .....	5
IV.	Scope of Work and Performance Tasks .....	6
V.	Implementation .....	11
VI.	Evaluation and Selection Process .....	11
VII.	Proposal Content .....	11
VIII.	Submittal Information .....	13
IX.	General RFP Requirement .....	14
X.	Contractual Information .....	15
XI.	Payments .....	16
XII.	Federal and State Funds .....	16
XIII.	Title VI Assurances .....	16
XIV.	Termination Provisions .....	18
XV.	Limitation on Consultant .....	18
XVI.	Conflict of Interest .....	18
XVII.	Insurance .....	19
XVIII.	Risk Management .....	19
	Exhibit A – Cost Proposal Form .....	21
	Exhibit B – Debarment of Suspension Certification .....	22
	Exhibit C – Certification of Restriction on Lobbying.....	23
	Exhibit D – Standard Form 330 .....	24

*Note: Throughout this RFP, Metro COG may be referred to as 'Client' and the consulting firm may be referred to as 'Consultant', 'Contractor', or 'Firm'.*

## **I AGENCY OVERVIEW**

The Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments (Metro COG) serves as the Council of Governments (COG) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the greater Fargo, North Dakota – Moorhead, Minnesota Metropolitan Area. As the designated MPO for the Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Area, Metro COG is responsible under federal law for maintaining a continuous, comprehensive, and coordinated transportation planning process.

Metro COG is responsible, in cooperation with the North Dakota and Minnesota Departments of Transportation (NDDOT and MnDOT, respectively) and our local planning partners, for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process and other planning needs of a regional nature. Metro COG represents eleven cities and two counties that comprise the Metro COG region in these efforts.

## **II BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

In 2016, Metro COG released the Southwest Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which looked at the future transportation needs of the Fargo-Moorhead Area's primary growth area. Specifically, a goal of the study was to determine the minimum level of arterial and collector capacity that would be needed given the level of development expected in the study area, in an effort to limit future infrastructure costs to the extent possible.

A few characteristics of the area play into the need for this analysis:

1. Drain 27 – In order to extend Veterans Blvd into the southwest growth area (areas south of 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S), it would need to cross Drain 27. The City of Fargo had concerns about the cost of constructing that crossing, including unknowns about the hydrology and FM Diversion. A significant amount of hydrology and elevation studies were taking place at that time.
2. Topography – The section of land on the east side of Drain 27, just south of 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S, is amongst the lowest lying areas in the region. As such, land in this vicinity is proposed to be a regional storm water detention pond. Subsequently, any roadway proposed in this area may need to be raised to be above the Base Flood Elevation or realigned to circumvent the proposed detention pond.
3. Future Development – The City of Fargo is interested in extending Veterans Blvd south of 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S to provide adequate access to developable lands in the southwest growth area. As development continues in the City of Horace, CR 17 will have an increased vehicular traffic burden. An extension of Veterans Blvd could help alleviate this increase traffic.



***Veterans Boulevard Corridor Extension Study***

4. Jurisdictional Boundaries – The current alignment of Veterans Blvd is on a section line. Following the section line south of 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave to 64<sup>th</sup> Ave S, the land is within Fargo city limits. From 64<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 1/2 mile south of 88<sup>th</sup> Ave S, the City of Horace is on the west side of the section line while City of Fargo land is immediately east side of the section line. Finally, the section line from 1/2 mile south of 88<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 100<sup>th</sup> Ave S is located entirely within Horace city limits.
5. Ongoing studies –
  - 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue South Corridor Study – Metro COG is currently conducting a corridor study analyzing the need for future improvements to 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S as development occurs in the southwest growth area. This effort will conclude in April 2020.
  - Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan – Metro COG is also conducting a comprehensive and transportation plan for the City of Horace. This Plan is anticipated to be completed by in March/April of 2020.

**III PROJECT OBJECTIVE**

This project is grouped into three focus areas with various objectives per each focus area. These focus areas are listed below in the following orders of emphasis:

**1. Veterans Blvd from 40<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S**

- Detail conditions in the study area that would determine the feasibility of extending Veterans Blvd from 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S to 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S
- Determine how the facility will meet the needs of the future transportation system in the southwest growth area by analyzing alternatives that place the corridor on the section line as well as east of the section line, which moves the corridor fully within Fargo city limits
- Develop a vision for the corridor in consultation with regional stakeholders
- Analyze current and future intersection operations, with emphasis on the segment between 40<sup>th</sup> Ave S and 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S
- Utilize the Fargo-Moorhead Area travel demand model in determining future vehicular traffic projections along Veterans Blvd between 40<sup>th</sup> Ave S and 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S
- Identify future east/west connectivity to/from the corridor, including an alternative for a drain crossing that would provide a westerly connection to Deer Creek Addition at 59<sup>th</sup> Ave S
- Identify alternatives that would overcome obstacles to the roadway's extension
- Develop planning level cost estimates for each roadway alternative

**2. Veterans Blvd from 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 100<sup>th</sup> Ave S**

- Detail conditions in the study area that would determine the feasibility of extending Veterans Blvd from 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S to 100<sup>th</sup> Ave S
- Determine how the facility will meet the needs of the future transportation system in the southwest growth area by analyzing alternatives that place the corridor on the section line as well as east of the section line, which

- moves the corridor fully within Fargo city limits
  - Develop a vision for the corridor in consultation with regional stakeholders
  - Utilize the Fargo-Moorhead Area travel demand model in determining future vehicular traffic projections along Veterans Blvd between 76<sup>th</sup> Ave S and 100<sup>th</sup> Ave S
  - Identify alternatives that would overcome obstacles to the roadway's extension
  - Develop planning level cost estimates for each roadway alternative
- 3. Sheyenne St / CR 17 from 40<sup>th</sup> Ave to 76<sup>th</sup> Ave**
- Using the Fargo-Moorhead Area travel demand model, provide Metro COG with future ADT traffic volumes for Sheyenne St/CR 17 between 40<sup>th</sup> Ave and 76<sup>th</sup> Ave. A minimum of two scenarios should be provided: (1) a scenario with no Veterans Blvd extension and (2) a Veterans Blvd extension.

The map below shows the locations of the focus areas.

[MAP TO BE INCLUDED]

#### **IV SCOPE OF WORK AND PERFORMANCE TASKS**

Outlined below is the scope of work that will guide development of the Veterans Blvd / Sheyenne St / CR 17 Corridor Study. Metro COG has included the following scope of work to provide interested Consultants insight into project intent, context, coordination, responsibilities, and other elements to help facilitate proposal development.

This outline is not necessarily all-inclusive. The consultant may include in the proposal any additional performance tasks or the modification of the tasks listed below that will integrate approaches, with special emphasis on the use of innovative techniques, to successfully complete the project.

At minimum, the Consultant is expected to complete the following tasks as part of this project:

##### **Task 1 – Project Management and Coordination**

The consultant will be required to manage the study and coordinate with any subconsultants, as well as bearing responsibility for all documentation and equipment needs. The consultant will identify a project lead from their team to act as the direct point of contact for Metro COG's project manager.

The consultant should expect monthly progress meetings with Metro COG, a summary of

the meetings shall be prepared by the consultant. The consultant should expect other meetings with Metro COG on an as-needed basis. These meetings with Metro COG can occur via phone.

Additionally, the consultant should expect to prepare monthly progress reports, submit adequate documentation of any and all travel and expense receipts, and prepare and submit invoices on a monthly basis. When submitting progress reports, the consultant will be required to outline the following:

- Performed work during the reporting period
- Upcoming tasks
- Upcoming milestones
- Status of scope and schedule
- Any issues to be aware of

All invoices, travel and expense receipts, and progress reports, are due to Metro COG's project manager no later than the 1<sup>st</sup> Thursday of each month. This is to ensure invoices are processed in a timely fashion.

## **Task 2 – Data Collection and Existing Conditions**

The consultant shall gather and analyze existing conditions relative to the proposed study area. Metro COG and its local jurisdictions will aid in these efforts by providing relevant datasets where they exist. All other non-existing datasets necessary to accomplish the goals of the analysis will need to be developed by the consultant. (note – engineering style services such as surveying and geotechnical analysis are not eligible for reimbursement with federal transportation funds; therefore, such datasets will need to be developed through planning and research normal to a desk review) This should include (but is not limited to):

- Topology – The consultant will need to incorporate elevation and topology of the areas where alternatives may be developed.
- Land Use – The study should incorporate planned land uses within the study area that may affect the alignment of the facility. This should include coordination with the City of Fargo Public Works and Engineering Departments on a planned regional storm water detention pond that is planned to occur adjacent to Drain 27.
- Plan Consistency and Alignment – The consultant will need to incorporate the findings of other Metro COG, City of Fargo, and City of Horace Plans into this study. Such plans include:
  - City of Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan
  - City of Fargo GO 2030 Plan
  - Metro COG Metro GROW – 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
  - Metro COG Southwest Metropolitan Transportation Plan

- o Metro COG 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor Study
- o Metro COG Fargo West Fargo Parking and Access Requirement Study

### **Task 3 – Community Engagement**

Community engagement will be in accordance with Metro COG’s Public Participation Plan and will involve the following:

#### **1) Study Review Committee Meetings**

Development of the Study will be guided by a Study Review Committee (SRC), which will provide oversight and input into the development of the Plan. Metro COG staff prefer in-person meetings on a regular basis throughout the planning process. The consultant should propose the quantity, timing, and content of these meetings. The consultant will be responsible for coordinating, scheduling, and developing agendas for the SRC meetings. This should be done in coordination with Metro COG’s project manager. The consultant will be expected to distribute materials to the SRC in a timely manner, no less than three business days prior to the meetings. The consultant is also responsible for the recording of meeting minutes, which should be submitted to Metro COG’s project manager and will be serve as documentation of the SRC’s guidance and decisions.

#### **2) Public Involvement**

Public involvement opportunities will be held to obtain feedback from community members from all parts of the study area. This effort should particularly focus on those residents, business, and communities that would be impacted by the project. The consultant should propose engagement methods they think would be most successful in the planning effort to solicit direct participation. The consultant will facilitate all public engagement activities, and should propose the number, type, and strategy for each public involvement effort.

At a minimum, public involvement should include:

- a) Website, Social Media, and Online Survey – Metro COG will host a project website for this study. Metro COG will work with the Consultant in obtaining materials to display on the project website. In addition to the website, the Consultant should plan for coordination with Metro COG, the cities of Fargo and Horace, and any other applicable agencies/organizations in utilizing social media for public notification and public feedback.

As a way to increase public participation, the Consultant is encouraged to develop online surveys which can be hosted on Metro COG’s project webpage and shared via the local jurisdictions’, social media, etc.

- b) Public Input Meetings – The consultant shall propose an approach to public input meetings during the course of the Study.

The Consultant will be responsible for providing advertising materials including flyers, media release write-up, and an advertisement for the public notice to be published in the newspaper. The Consultant will also be responsible for mailing public meeting notices to all property owners adjacent to the corridor. All public notice costs, including mail costs, will be the responsibility of the Consultant and should be accounted for as part of the project budget. A postcard-size mailing may be used to reduce postage costs.

The Consultant will provide a summary of all public input meetings and is responsible for providing materials at the meetings, including but not limited to, sign-in sheets, comment forms, handouts, roll drawings, meeting display boards, and meeting presentations. All public comments received shall be recorded and included in the final report or an appropriate report appendix. The Consultant will provide a contact person for which the public to provide input. The contact person shall be made available by phone, mail and e-mail.

### 3) Stakeholder Outreach

In conjunction with Metro COG and the SRC, the consultant shall develop a list of stakeholders with a vested interest in the corridor. These stakeholders should include, but not be limited to: Fargo Arts and Culture Commission, local park districts, etc. The consultant should expect to meet with stakeholders to obtain input and keep them apprised of the Study's progress.

## **Task 4 – Visioning**

The consultant should work with the SRC, stakeholders, and the public in developing a future vision for the corridor. The vision should include the desired appearance, feel, and function of the corridor and should take into account the future context and land use adjacent to the corridor. Visioning of the corridor should consider all modes of transportation – vehicular, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit. This effort may not result in a singular vision, but could result in multiple visions for the corridor.

Recommendations from adopted plans should be researched and considered when developing corridor vision(s). These plans should include but not be limited to:

- City of Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan
- City of Fargo GO 2030 Plan
- Metro COG Metro GROW – 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan
- Metro COG Southwest Metropolitan Transportation Plan
- Metro COG 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor Study

- Metro COG Fargo West Fargo Parking and Access Requirement Study

#### **Task 5 – Travel Demand Modeling**

This task should bring forward the scenarios/visions developed in Task 4 to see how the transportation system is impacted using the Fargo-Moorhead Area travel demand model. This should include a null option, where Veterans Blvd is not extended beyond 52<sup>nd</sup> Ave S.

At a minimum, the consultant shall provide future vehicular traffic projection outputs for the Veterans Blvd corridor and Sheyenne St/CR 17 from 40<sup>th</sup> Ave to 76<sup>th</sup> Ave.

Metro COG will work with the cities of Fargo and Horace to determine if any TAZ socio-economic data updates are needed to the current travel demand model.

#### **Task 6 – Purpose and Need**

The Consultant shall work with Metro COG and the SRC in developing a Purpose and Need Statement for inclusion within the study.

#### **Task 7 – Development of Alternatives**

The consultant should prepare a list of feasible alternatives to be included in the final planning document. No fewer than three (3) final alternatives shall be included. Other alternatives that were considered, but not brought forward in the planning process should be well documented, to include an explanation of the infeasibility of the alternative alignment.

As part of this task, the consultant will prepare planning level cost estimates that will include sub-options for intersection types, various feasible structures, and any other types of options that could be decided upon when bringing the project forward into design.

#### **Task 8 - Draft Report**

Upon completion of the previous tasks, the Consultant shall provide a draft report for review by the SRC and the public. The report shall include but not be limited to: existing conditions information, the study's purpose and need, public involvement information and results, corridor alternatives and costs, and graphics.

The report shall include an executive summary summarizing the key contents in the report. Also, the report shall include an appendix. All meeting summaries and technical analysis shall be included in the appendix of the report.

#### **Task 9 - Final Report**

Once comments on the draft report have been received and addressed, the Consultant shall assemble the final report. The final report shall be in PDF format.

### **Task 10 – Adoption Process**

As part of the study’s adoption process, presentation will be made to local boards and committees. The Consultant should budget for up to three presentations of the final study to local boards and committees. These boards and committees may include, but are not limited to the following: Fargo City Commission, Horace City Commission, Metro COG Transportation Technical Committee, and Metro COG Policy Board.

## **V IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE – TENTATIVE**

### **1) Consultant Selection**

Advertise for Consultant Proposals	approximately 2/21/2020
Due Date for Proposal Submittals (by 4:30pm)	3/18/2020
Review Proposals/Identify Finalists	3/19/2020 - 3/25/2020
Interview Finalists	between 3/30/2020 – 4/6/2020
Metro COG Board Approval/Consultant Notice	4/16/2020
Contract Negotiations	4/20/2020 – 4/24/2020
Signed Contract	Immediately after contract negotiations
Notice to Proceed	One day following a signed contract

### **2) Project Development (Major Milestones)**

Project Kick-off	May, 2020
Corridor Study Development	May, 2020 - February, 2021
Final Draft of Corridor Study	March, 2021
Final Completion of Study	April, 2021
Presentations to committees and boards	May, 2021 – June, 2021
All invoices for project to be received by Metro COG	June, 2021

## **VI EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS**

**Selection Committee.** The Client will establish a selection committee to select a Consultant. The committee will likely consist of staff from Metro COG, the City of Fargo, the City of Horace, and other applicable stakeholders

The Consultant selection process will be administered under the following criteria:

- 20% - Understanding of study objectives and local/regional issues
- 20% - Proposed approach, work plan, and management techniques
- 20% - Experience with similar projects
- 20% - Expertise of the technical and professional staff assigned to the project
- 20% - Current workload and ability to meet deadlines

The Selection Committee, at the discretion of the Client and under the guidance of

NDDOT policy, will entertain formal oral presentations for the top candidates to provide additional information for the evaluation process. The oral presentations will be followed by a question and answer period during which the committee may question the prospective Consultants about their proposed approaches.

A Consultant will be selected on **April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2020** based on an evaluation of the proposals submitted, the recommendation of the Selection Committee and approval by the Metro COG Policy Board.

The Client reserves the right to reject any or all proposals or to waive minor irregularities in said proposal, and reserves the right to negotiate minor deviations to the proposal with the successful Consultant. The Client reserves the right to award a contract to the firm or individual that presents the proposal, which, in the sole judgement of the Client, best accomplishes the desired results.

The RFP does not commit the Client to award a contract, to pay any costs incurred in the preparation of the contract in response to this request or to procure or contract for services or supplies. The Client reserves the right to withdraw this RFP at any time without prior notice.

All proposals, whether selected or rejected, shall become the property of the Client.

## **VII PROPOSAL CONTENT**

The purpose of the proposal is to demonstrate the qualifications, competence, and capacity of the Consultant seeking to provide comprehensive services specified herein for the Client, in conformity with the requirements of the RFP. The proposal should demonstrate qualifications of the firm and its staff to undertake this project. It should also specify the proposed approach that best meets the RFP requirements. The proposal must address each of the service specifications under the Scope of Work and Performance Tasks.

The Client is asking the Consultant to supply the following information. Please include all requested information in the proposal to the fullest extent practical.

- 1) Contact Information.** Name, telephone number, email address, mailing address and other contact information for the Consultant's Project Manager.
- 2) Introduction and Executive Summary.** This section shall document the Consultant name, business address (including telephone, FAX, email address(es)), year established, type of ownership and parent company (if any), project manager name and qualifications, and any major facts, features, recommendations or conclusions that may differentiate this proposal from others, if any.
- 3) Work Plan and Project Methodology.** Proposals shall include the following, at minimum:
  - a) A detailed work plan identifying the major tasks to be accomplished



relative to the requested study tasks and expected product as outlined in this RFP;

- b) A timeline for completion of the requested services, including all public participation opportunities and stakeholder meetings, identifying milestones for development of the project and completion of individual tasks.
- c) List of projects with similar size, scope, type, and complexity that the proposed project team has successfully completed in the past.
- d) List of the proposed principal(s) who will be responsible for the work, proposed Project Manager and project team members (with resumes).
- e) A breakout of hours for each member of the team by major task area, and an overall indication of the level of effort (percentage of overall project team hours) allocated to each task. Note that specific budget information is to be submitted in a sealed cost proposal as described below in Section VIII. General Proposal Requirements.
- f) A list of any subcontracted agencies, the tasks they will be assigned, the percent of work to be performed, and the staff that will be assigned.
- g) List of client references for similar projects described within the RFP.
- h) Required Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) and/or Minority Business Enterprise (MBE) Firms participation documentation, if applicable.
- i) Ability of firm to meet required time schedules based on current and known future workload of the staff assigned to the project.

**4) Signature.** Proposals shall be signed in ink by an authorized member of the firm/project team.

**5) Attachments.** Review, complete, and submit the completed versions of the following RFP Attachments with the proposal:

Exhibit A - Cost Proposal Form (as identified in VIII 1)

Exhibit B – Debarment of Suspension Certification

Exhibit C – Certification of Restriction on Lobbying

Exhibit D - Standard Form 330 (if required – see page 2)

## **VIII Submittal Information**

Hard copies of technical and cost proposals should be shipped to ensure timely delivery to the contact as defined below:

Dan Farnsworth  
Transportation Planner  
Fargo-Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments  
Case Plaza, Suite 232  
One 2<sup>nd</sup> Street North  
Fargo, ND 58102-4807  
[farnsworth@fmmetrocog.org](mailto:farnsworth@fmmetrocog.org)

Proposals shall be received by **4:30 pm (Central Time) on Wednesday March 18, 2020** at the Metro COG office. Minority, women-owned and disadvantaged business enterprises are encouraged to participate. Respondents must submit seven (7) hard copies and one Adobe Acrobat (.pdf) copy of the proposal. The full length of each proposal should not exceed twenty (20) double sided pages for a total of forty (40) pages; including any supporting material, charts or tables.

## **IX GENERAL RFP REQUIREMENTS**

- 1) Sealed Cost Proposal.** All proposals must be clearly identified and marked with the appropriate project name; inclusive of a separately sealed cost proposal per the requirements of this RFP. Cost proposals shall be based on an hourly “not to exceed” amount and shall follow the general format as provided within Exhibit A of this RFP. Metro COG may decide, in its sole discretion, to negotiate a price for the project after the selection committee completes its final ranking. Negotiation will begin with the Consultant identified as the most qualified per requirements of this RFP, as determined in the evaluation/selection process. If Metro COG is unable to negotiate a contract for services negotiations will be terminated and negotiations will begin with the next most qualified Consultant. This process will continue until a satisfactory contract has been negotiated.
- 2) Consultant Annual Audit Information for Indirect Cost.** Consulting firms proposing to do work for Metro COG must have a current audit rate no older than 15 months from the close of the firms Fiscal Year. Documentation of this audit rate must be provided with the sealed cost proposal. Firms that do not meet this requirement will not qualify to propose or contract for Metro COG projects until the requirement is met. Firms that have submitted all the necessary information to Metro COG and are waiting for the completion of the audit will be qualified to submit proposals for work. Information submitted by a firm that is incomplete will not qualify. Firms that do not have a current cognizant Federal Acquisition Regulations (FARs) audit of indirect cost rates must provide this audit prior to the interview. **This documentation should be attached with the sealed cost proposal.**
- 3) Debarment of Suspension Certification and Certification of Restriction on Lobbying.** Respondents must attach signed copies of Exhibit B – Debarment of Suspension Certification and Exhibit C – Certification of Restriction on Lobbying within the sealed cost proposal, as well as Exhibit D - Standard Form 330.
- 4) Respondent Qualifications.** Respondents must submit evidence that they have relevant past experience and have previously delivered services similar to the requested services within this RFP. Each respondent may also be required to show that similar work has been performed in a satisfactory manner and that no claims of any kind are pending against such work. No proposal will be accepted from a respondent whom is engaged in any work that would impair his or her ability to

perform or finance this work.

- 5) **Disadvantaged Business Enterprise.** Pursuant to Department of Transportation policy and 49 CFR Part 23, Metro COG supports the participation of DBE/MBE businesses in the performance of contracts financed with federal funds under this RFP. Consultants shall make an effort to involve DBE/MBE businesses in this project. If the Consultant is a DBE/MBE, a statement indicating that the business is certified DBE/MBE in North Dakota or Minnesota shall be included within the proposal. If the Consultant intends to utilize a DBE/MBE to complete a portion of this work, a statement of the Subconsultant's certification shall be included. The percent of the total proposed cost to be completed by the DBE/MBE shall be shown within the proposal. Respondents should substantiate (within proposal) efforts made to include DBE/MBE businesses.
- 6) **US DOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations.** Consultants are advised to review and consider the *US DOT Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation* issued in March of 2010 when developing written proposals.
- 7) **North Dakota Department of Transportation Consultant Administration Services Procedure Manual.** Applicants to this Request for Proposal are required to follow procedures contained in the *NDDOT Consultant Administration Services Procedure Manual*, which includes prequalification of Consultants. Copies of the Manual may be found on the Metro COG website [www.fmmetrocog.org](http://www.fmmetrocog.org) or the NDDOT website at [www.dot.nd.gov](http://www.dot.nd.gov).

## **X CONTRACTUAL INFORMATION**

- 1) The Client reserves the right to reject any or all proposals or to award the contract to the next most qualified firm if the successful firm does not execute a contract within forty-five (45) days after the award of the proposal. The Client will not pay for any information contained in proposals obtained from participating firms.
- 2) The Client reserves the right to request clarification on any information submitted and additionally reserves the right to request additional information of one (1) or more applicants.
- 3) Any proposal may be withdrawn up until the proposal submission deadline. Any proposals not withdrawn shall constitute an irrevocable offer for services set forth within the RFP for a period of ninety (90) days or until one or more of the proposals have been approved by the Metro COG Policy Board.
- 4) If, through any cause, the Consultant shall fail to fulfill in a timely and proper manner the obligations agreed to, the Client shall have the right to terminate its contract by specifying the date of termination in a written notice to the firm at least ninety (90) working days before the termination date. In this event, the firm

shall be entitled to just and equitable compensation for any satisfactory work completed.

- 5) Any agreement or contract resulting from the acceptance of a proposal shall be on forms either supplied by or approved by the Client and shall contain, as a minimum, applicable provisions of the Request for Proposals. The Client reserves the right to reject any agreement that does not conform to the Request for Proposal and any Metro COG requirements for agreements and contracts.
- 6) The Consultant shall not assign any interest in the contract and shall not transfer any interest in the same without prior written consent of Metro COG.

## **XI PAYMENTS**

The selected Consultant will submit invoices for work completed to the Client. Payments shall be made to the Consultant by the Client in accordance with the contract after all required services, and items identified in the scope of work and performance tasks, have been completed to the satisfaction of the Client.

## **XII FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS**

The services requested within this RFP will be partially funded with funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). As such, the services requested by this RFP will be subject to federal and state requirements and regulations.

The services performed under any resulting agreement shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. In addition, this contract will be subject to the relevant requirements of 2 CFR 200.

## **XIII TITLE VI ASSURANCES**

Prospective Consultants should be aware of the following contractual ("Contractor") requirements regarding compliance with Title VI should they be selected pursuant to this RFP:

- 1) **Compliance with Regulations.** The Consultant shall comply with the regulations relative to nondiscrimination in Federally-assisted programs of the U.S. Department of Transportation, Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 21, as they may be amended from time to time (hereinafter referred to as the Regulations).
- 2) **Nondiscrimination.** The Consultant, with regard to the work performed by it, shall not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability/handicap, or income status\*\*, in the selection and retention of Subconsultants, including procurements of materials and leases of equipment. The Consultant shall not participate, either directly or indirectly, in the discrimination

prohibited by Section 21.5 of the Regulations, including employment practices when the contract covers a program set forth in Appendix B of the Regulations.

- 3) **Solicitations for Subcontracts, Including Procurements of Materials and Equipment.** In all solicitations, either by competitive bidding or negotiation, made by the Consultant for work to be performed under a subcontract, including procurements of materials or leases of equipment, each potential Subconsultant or supplier shall be notified by the Consultant of the Consultant's obligations to Metro COG and the Regulations relative to nondiscrimination on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability/handicap, or income status\*\*.
- 4) **Information and Reports.** The Consultant shall provide all information and reports required by the Regulations, or directives issued pursuant thereto, and shall permit access to its books, records, accounts, other sources of information and its facilities as may be determined by Metro COG or the North Dakota Department of Transportation to be pertinent to ascertain compliance with such Regulations, orders, and instructions. Where any information required of a Consultant is in the exclusive possession of another who fails or refuses to furnish this information, the Consultant shall so certify to Metro COG, or the North Dakota Department of Transportation, as appropriate, and shall set forth what efforts it has made to obtain the information.
- 5) **Sanctions for Noncompliance.** In the event of the Consultant's noncompliance with the nondiscrimination provisions as outlined herein, the Client and the North Dakota Department of Transportation shall impose such sanctions as it or the Federal Highway Administration / Federal Transit Administration may determine to be appropriate, including but not limited to:
  - 6) Withholding of payments to the Consultant under the contract until the Consultant complies; or
  - 7) Cancellation, termination, or suspension of the contract, in whole or in part.
- 8) **Incorporation of Title VI Provisions.** The Consultant shall include the provisions of Section XII, paragraphs 1 through 5 in every subcontract, including procurements of materials and leases of equipment, unless exempt by the Regulations or directives issued pursuant thereto.

The Consultant shall take such action with respect to any subcontract or procurement as Metro COG or the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions, including sanctions for noncompliance provided, however, that in the event a Consultant becomes involved in, or is threatened with, litigation by a Subconsultant or supplier as a result of such direction, the Consultant may request Metro COG enter into such litigation to protect the interests of Metro COG; and, in addition, the Consultant may request the United States to enter into such litigation to protect the interests of the United States.

\*\* The Act governs race, color, and national origin. Related Nondiscrimination Authorities govern sex, 23 U.S.C. 324; age, 42 U.S.C. 6101; disability/handicap, 29 U.S.C. 790; and low income, E.O. 12898.

#### **XIV TERMINATION PROVISIONS**

The Client reserves the right to cancel any contract for cause upon written notice to the Consultant. Cause for cancellation will be documented failure(s) of the Consultant to provide services in the quantity or quality required. Notice of such cancellation will be given with sufficient time to allow for the orderly withdrawal of the Consultant without additional harm to the participants or the Client.

The Client may cancel or reduce the amount of service to be rendered if there is, in the opinion of the Client, a significant increase in local costs; or if there is insufficient state or federal funding available for the service, thereby terminating the contract or reducing the compensation to be paid under the contract. In such event, the Client will notify the Consultant in writing ninety (90) days in advance of the date such actions are to be implemented.

In the event of any termination, the Client shall pay the agreed rate only for services delivered up to the date of termination. The Client has no obligation to the Consultant, of any kind, after the date of termination. Consultant shall deliver all records, equipment and materials to the Client within 24 hours of the date of termination.

#### **XV LIMITATION ON CONSULTANT**

All reports and pertinent data or materials are the sole property of the Client and its state and federal planning partners and may not be used, reproduced or released in any form without the explicit, written permission of the Client.

The Consultant should expect to have access only to the public reports and public files of local governmental agencies and the Client in preparing the proposal or reports. No compilation, tabulation or analysis of data, definition of opinion, etc., should be anticipated by the Consultant from the agencies, unless volunteered by a responsible official in those agencies.

#### **XVI CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

No Consultant, Subconsultant, or member of any firm proposed to be employed in the preparation of this proposal shall have a past, ongoing, or potential involvement which could be deemed a conflict of interest under North Dakota Century Code or other law. During the term of this Agreement, the Consultant shall not accept any employment or engage in any consulting work that would create a conflict of interest with the Client or in any way compromise the services to be performed under this agreement. The Consultant shall immediately notify the Client of any and all potential violations of this paragraph upon becoming aware of the potential violation.

## **XVII INSURANCE**

The Consultant shall provide evidence of insurance as stated in the contract prior to execution of the contract.

## **XVIII RISK MANAGEMENT**

The Consultant agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the Client and the state of North Dakota, its agencies, officers and employees (State), from and against claims based on the vicarious liability of the Client and the State or its agents, but not against claims based on the Client's and the State's contributory negligence, comparative and/or contributory negligence or fault, sole negligence, or intentional misconduct. The legal defense provided by Consultant to the Client and the State under this provision must be free of any conflicts of interest, even if retention of separate legal counsel for the Client and the State is necessary. Consultant also agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold the Client and the State harmless for all costs, expenses and attorneys' fees incurred if the Client or the State prevails in an action against Consultant in establishing and litigating the indemnification coverage provided herein. This obligation shall continue after the termination of this Agreement.

The Consultant shall secure and keep in force during the term of this agreement, from insurance companies, government self-insurance pools or government self-retention funds authorized to do business in North Dakota, the following insurance coverage:

1. Commercial general liability and automobile liability insurance - minimum limits of liability required are \$250,000 per person and \$1,000,000 per occurrence.
2. Workforce Safety insurance meeting all statutory limits.
3. The Client and the State of North Dakota, its agencies, officers, and employees (State) shall be endorsed as an additional insured on the commercial general liability and automobile liability policies.
4. Said endorsements shall contain a "Waiver of Subrogation" in favor of the Client and the state of North Dakota.
5. The policies and endorsements may not be canceled or modified without thirty (30) days prior written notice to the undersigned Client and the State Risk Management Department.

The Consultant shall furnish a certificate of insurance evidencing the requirements in 1, 3, and 4, above to the Client prior to commencement of this agreement.

The Client and the State reserve the right to obtain complete, certified copies of all required insurance documents, policies, or endorsements at any time. Any attorney who represents the State under this contract must first qualify as and be appointed by the

North Dakota Attorney General as a Special Assistant Attorney General as required under N.D.C.C. Section 54-12-08.

When a portion of the work under the Agreement is sublet, the Consultant shall obtain insurance protection (as outlined above) to provide liability coverage to protect the Consultant, the Client and the State as a result of work undertaken by the Subconsultant. In addition, the Consultant shall ensure that any and all parties performing work under the Agreement are covered by public liability insurance as outlined above. All Subconsultants performing work under the Agreement are required to maintain the same scope of insurance required of the Consultant. The Consultant shall be held responsible for ensuring compliance with those requirements by all Subconsultants.

Consultant's insurance coverage shall be primary (i.e., pay first) as respects any insurance, self-insurance or self-retention maintained by the Client or State. Any insurance, self-insurance or self-retention maintained by the Client or the State shall be excess of the Consultant's insurance and shall not contribute with it. The insolvency or bankruptcy of the insured Consultant shall not release the insurer from payment under the policy, even when such insolvency or bankruptcy prevents the insured Consultant from meeting the retention limit under the policy. Any deductible amount or other obligations under the policy(ies) shall be the sole responsibility of the Consultant. This insurance may be in a policy or policies of insurance, primary and excess, including the so-called umbrella or catastrophe form and be placed with insurers rated "A-" or better by A.M. Best Company, Inc. The Client and the State will be indemnified, saved, and held harmless to the full extent of any coverage actually secured by the Consultant in excess of the minimum requirements set forth above.



### Exhibit A – Cost Proposal Form

**Cost Proposal Form** – Include completed cost form (see below) in a separate sealed envelope – labeled “**Sealed Cost Form – Vendor Name**” and submit with concurrently with the technical proposal as part of the overall RFP response. The cost estimate should be based on a not to exceed basis and may be further negotiated by Metro COG upon identification of the most qualified Consultant. Changes in the final contract amount and contract extensions are not anticipated.

### REQUIRED BUDGET FORMAT

Summary of Estimated Project Cost

1.	Direct Labor	Hours	x	Rate	=	Project Cost	Total
	Name, Title, Function	0.00	x	0.00	=	0.00	0.00
			x		=	0.00	0.00
			x		=	0.00	0.00
				Subtotal	=	0.00	0.00
2.	Overhead/Indirect Cost (expressed as indirect rate x direct labor)					0.00	0.00
3.	Subconsultant Costs					0.00	0.00
4.	Materials and Supplies Costs					0.00	0.00
5.	Travel Costs					0.00	0.00
6.	Fixed Fee					0.00	0.00
7.	Miscellaneous Costs					0.00	0.00
Total Cost					=	0.00	0.00

## **Exhibit B - Debarment of Suspension Certification**

### Background and Applicability

In conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget and other affected Federal agencies, DOT published an update to 49 CFR Part 29 on November 26, 2003. This government-wide regulation implements Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, Executive Order 12689, Debarment and Suspension, and 31 U.S.C. 6101 note (Section 2455, Public Law 103-255, 108 Stat. 3327).

The provisions of Part 29 apply to all grantee contracts and subcontracts at any level expected to equal or exceed \$25,000 as well as any contract or subcontract (at any level) for federally-required auditing services (49 CFR 29.220(b)). This represents a change from prior practice in that the dollar threshold for application of these rules has been lowered from \$100,000 to \$25,000. These are contracts and subcontracts referred to in the regulation as "covered transactions."

Grantees, contractors, and subcontractors (at any level) that enter into covered transactions are required to verify that the entity (as well as its principals and affiliates) they propose to contract or subcontract with is not excluded or disqualified. They do this by (a) Checking the Excluded Parties List System, (b) Collecting a certification from that person, or (c) Adding a clause or condition to the contract or subcontract. This represents a change from prior practice in that certification is still acceptable but is no longer required (49 CFR 29.300).

Grantees, contractors, and subcontractors who enter into covered transactions also must require the entities they contract with to comply with 49 CFR 29, subpart C and include this requirement in their own subsequent covered transactions (i.e., the requirement flows down to subcontracts at all levels).

Instructions for Certification: By signing and submitting this bid or proposal, the prospective lower tier participant is providing the signed certification set out below.

### Suspension and Debarment

This contract is a covered transaction for purposes of 49 CFR Part 29. As such, the contractor is required to verify that none of the contractor, its principals, as defined in 49 CFR 29.995, or affiliates, as defined at 49 CFR 29.905, are excluded or disqualified as defined at 49 CFR 29.940 and 29.945.

The contractor is required to comply with 49 CFR 29, Subpart C and must include the requirement to comply with 49 CFR 29, Subpart C in any lower tier covered transaction it enters into.

By signing and submitting its bid or proposal, the bidder or proposer certifies as follows:

The certification in this clause is a material representation of fact relied upon by the recipient. If it is later determined that the bidder or proposer knowingly rendered an erroneous certification, in addition to remedies available to the recipient, the Federal Government may pursue available remedies, including but not limited to suspension and/or debarment. The bidder or proposer agrees to comply with the requirements of 49 CFR 29, Subpart C while this offer is valid and throughout the period of any contract that may arise from this order. The bidder or proposer further agrees to include a provision requiring such compliance in its lower tier covered transactions.

Contractor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Authorized Official \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

Name & Title of Contractor's Authorized Official

\_\_\_\_\_

### Exhibit C - Certification of Restriction on Lobbying

I, \_\_\_\_\_ hereby certify on  
(Name and Title of Grantee Official)

behalf of \_\_\_\_\_ that:  
(Name of Bidder / Company Name)

- No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, and officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the awarding of any federal contract, the making of any federal grant, the making of any federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.
- If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.
- The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all sub-awards at all tiers (including subcontracts, sub-grants, and contracts under grants, loans, and cooperative agreements) and that all sub-recipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by 31 U.S. Code 1352 (as amended by the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995). Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than \$10,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each such failure.

The undersigned certifies or affirms the truthfulness and accuracy of the contents of the statements submitted on or with this certification and understands that the provisions of 31 U.S.C. Section 3801, et seq., are applicable thereto.

Name of Bidder / Company Name

\_\_\_\_\_

Type or print name

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of authorized representative \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(Title of authorized official)

**Exhibit D - Standard Form 330**

*SEE FOLLOWING PAGES*

# ARCHITECT-ENGINEER QUALIFICATIONS

OMB Control Number: 9000-0157  
Expiration Date: 12/31/2020

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement - This information collection meets the requirements of 44 USC § 3507, as amended by section 2 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. You do not need to answer these questions unless we display a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 9000-0157. We estimate that it will take 29 hours (25 hours for part 1 and 4 hours for Part 2) to read the instructions, gather the facts, and answer the questions. Send only comments relating to our time estimate, including suggestions for reducing this burden, or any other aspects of this collection of information to: General Services Administration, Regulatory Secretariat Division (M1V1CB), 1800 F Street, NW, Washington, DC 20405.

## PURPOSE

Federal agencies use this form to obtain information from architect-engineer (A-E) firms about their professional qualifications. Federal agencies select firms for A-E contracts on the basis of professional qualifications as required by 40 U.S.C. chapter 11, Selection of Architects Engineers, and Part 36 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR).

The Selection of Architects and Engineers statute requires the public announcement of requirements for A-E services (with some exceptions provided by other statutes), and the selection of at least three of the most highly qualified firms based on demonstrated competence and professional qualifications according to specific criteria published in the announcement. The Act then requires the negotiation of a contract at a fair and reasonable price starting first with the most highly qualified firm.

The information used to evaluate firms is from this form and other sources, including performance evaluations, any additional data requested by the agency, and interviews with the most highly qualified firms and their references.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Part I presents the qualifications for a specific contract.

Part II presents the general qualifications of a firm or a specific branch office of a firm. Part II has two uses:

1. An A-E firm may submit Part II to the appropriate central, regional or local office of each Federal agency to be kept on file. A public announcement is not required for certain contracts, and agencies may use Part II as a basis for selecting at least three of the most highly qualified firms for discussions prior to requesting submission of Part I. Firms are encouraged to update Part II on file with agency offices, as appropriate, according to FAR Part 36. If a firm has branch offices, submit a separate Part II for each branch office seeking work.

2. Prepare a separate Part II for each firm that will be part of the team proposed for a specific contract and submitted with Part I. If a firm has branch offices, submit a separate Part II for each branch office that has a key role on the team.

## INDIVIDUAL AGENCY INSTRUCTIONS

Individual agencies may supplement these instructions. For example, they may limit the number of projects or number of pages submitted in Part I in response to a public announcement for a particular project. Carefully comply with any agency instructions when preparing and submitting this form. Be as concise as possible and provide only the information requested by the agency.

## DEFINITIONS

**Architect-Engineer Services:** Defined in FAR 2.101.

**Branch Office:** A geographically distinct place of business or subsidiary office of a firm that has a key role on the team.

**Discipline:** Primary technical capabilities of key personnel, as evidenced by academic degree, professional registration, certification, and/or extensive experience.

**Firm:** Defined in FAR 36.102.

**Key Personnel:** Individuals who will have major contract responsibilities and/or provide unusual or unique expertise.

## SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

### Part I - Contract-Specific Qualifications

#### Section A. Contract Information.

1. Title and Location. Enter the title and location of the contract for which this form is being submitted, exactly as shown in the public announcement or agency request.

2. Public Notice Date. Enter the posted date of the agency's notice on the Federal Business Opportunity website (FedBizOpps), other form of public announcement or agency request for this contract.

3. Solicitation or Project Number. Enter the agency's solicitation number and/or project number, if applicable, exactly as shown in the public announcement or agency request for this contract.

#### Section B. Architect-Engineer Point of Contact.

4-8. Name, Title, Name of Firm, Telephone Number, Fax (Facsimile) Number and E-mail (Electronic Mail) Address. Provide information for a representative of the prime contractor or joint venture that the agency can contact for additional information.

---

## Section C. Proposed Team.

### 9-11. Firm Name, Address, and Role in This Contract.

Provide the contractual relationship, name, full mailing address, and a brief description of the role of each firm that will be involved in performance of this contract. List the prime contractor or joint venture partners first. If a firm has branch offices, indicate each individual branch office that will have a key role on the team. The named subcontractors and outside associates or consultants must be used, and any change must be approved by the contracting officer. (See FAR Part 52 Clause "Subcontractors and Outside Associates and Consultants (Architect-Engineer Services)"). Attach an additional sheet in the same format as Section C if needed.

## Section D. Organizational Chart of Proposed Team.

As an attachment after Section C, present an organizational chart of the proposed team showing the names and roles of all key personnel listed in Section E and the firm they are associated with as listed in Section C.

## Section E. Resumes of Key Personnel Proposed for this Contract.

Complete this section for each key person who will participate in this contract. Group by firm, with personnel of the prime contractor or joint venture partner firms first. The following blocks must be completed for each resume:

12. Name. Self-explanatory.

13. Role in this contract. Self-explanatory.

14. Years Experience. Total years of relevant experience (block 14a), and years of relevant experience with current firm, but not necessarily the same branch office (block 14b).

15. Firm Name and Location. Name, city and state of the firm where the person currently works, which must correspond with one of the firms (or branch office of a firm, if appropriate) listed in Section C.

16. Education. Provide information on the highest relevant academic degree(s) received. Indicate the area(s) of specialization for each degree.

17. Current Professional Registration. Provide information on current relevant professional registration(s) in a State or possession of the United States, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia according to FAR Part 36.

18. Other Professional Qualifications. Provide information on any other professional qualifications relating to this contract, such as education, professional registration, publications, organizational memberships, certifications, training, awards, and foreign language capabilities.

19. Relevant Projects. Provide information on up to five projects in which the person had a significant role that demonstrates the person's capability relevant to her/his proposed role in this contract. These projects do not necessarily have to be any of the projects presented in Section F for the project team if the person was not involved in any of those projects or the person worked on other projects that were more relevant than the team projects in Section F. Use the check box provided to indicate if the project was performed with any office of the current firm. If any of the professional services or construction projects are not complete, leave Year Completed blank and indicate the status in Brief Description and Specific Role (block (3)).

## Section F. Example Projects Which Best Illustrate Proposed Team's Qualifications for this Contract.

Select projects where multiple team members worked together, if possible, that demonstrate the team's capability to perform work similar to that required for this contract. Complete one Section F for each project. Present ten projects, unless otherwise specified by the agency. Complete the following blocks for each project:

20. Example Project Key Number. Start with "1" for the first project and number consecutively.

21. Title and Location. Title and location of project or contract. For an indefinite delivery contract, the location is the geographic scope of the contract.

22. Year Completed. Enter the year completed of the professional services (such as planning, engineering study, design, or surveying), and/or the year completed of construction, if applicable. If any of the professional services or the construction projects are not complete, leave Year Completed blank and indicate the status in Brief Description of Project and Relevance to this Contract (block 24).

23a. Project Owner. Project owner or user, such as a government agency or installation, an institution, a corporation or private individual.

23b. Point of Contact Name. Provide name of a person associated with the project owner or the organization which contracted for the professional services, who is very familiar with the project and the firm's (or firms') performance.

23c. Point of Contact Telephone Number. Self-explanatory.

24. Brief Description of Project and Relevance to this Contract. Indicate scope, size, cost, principal elements and special features of the project. Discuss the relevance of the example project to this contract. Enter any other information requested by the agency for each example project.

25. Firms from Section C Involved with this Project. Indicate which firms (or branch offices, if appropriate) on the project team were involved in the example project, and their roles. List in the same order as Section C.

Section G. Key Personnel Participation in Example Projects.

This matrix is intended to graphically depict which key personnel identified in Section E worked on the example projects listed in Section F. Complete the following blocks (see example below).

26. and 27. Names of Key Personnel and Role in this Contract. List the names of the key personnel and their proposed roles in this contract in the same order as they appear in Section E.

28. Example Projects Listed in Section F. In the column under each project key number (see block 29) and for each key person, place an "X" under the project key number for participation in the same or similar role.

29. Example Projects Key. List the key numbers and titles of the example projects in the same order as they appear in Section F.

Section H. Additional Information.

30. Use this section to provide additional information specifically requested by the agency or to address selection criteria that are not covered by the information provided in Sections A-G.

Section I. Authorized Representative.

31. and 32. Signature of Authorized Representative and Date. An authorized representative of a joint venture or the prime contractor must sign and date the completed form. Signing attests that the information provided is current and factual, and that all firms on the proposed team agree to work on the project. Joint ventures selected for negotiations must make available a statement of participation by a principal of each member of the joint venture.

33. Name and Title. Self-explanatory.

SAMPLE ENTRIES FOR SECTION G (MATRIX)

26. NAMES OF KEY PERSONNEL (From Section E, Block 12)	27. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT (From Section E, Block 13)	28. EXAMPLE PROJECTS LISTED IN SECTION F (Fill in "Example Projects Key" section below first, before completing table. Place "X" under project key number for participation in same or similar role.)									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Jane A. Smith	Chief Architect	X		X							
Joseph B. Williams	Chief Mechanical Engineer	X	X	X	X						
Tara C. Donovan	Chief Electricial Engineer	X	X		X						

29. EXAMPLE PROJECTS KEY

NUMBER	TITLE OF EXAMPLE PROJECT (From Section F)	NUMBER	TITLE OF EXAMPLE PROJECT (From Section F)
1	Federal Courthouse, Denver, CO	6	XYZ Corporation Headquarters, Boston, MA
2	Justin J. Wilson Federal Building, Baton Rouge, LA	7	Founder's Museum, Newport, RI

---

## Part II - General Qualifications

See the "**General Instructions**" on page 1 for firms with branch offices. Prepare Part II for the specific branch office seeking work if the firm has branch offices.

1. Solicitation Number. If Part II is submitted for a specific contract, insert the agency's solicitation number and/or project number, if applicable, exactly as shown in the public announcement or agency request.

2a-2e. Firm (or Branch Office) Name and Address. Self-explanatory.

3. Year Established. Enter the year the firm (or branch office, if appropriate) was established under the current name.

4. Unique Entity Identifier. Insert the unique entity identifier issued by the entity designated at SAM. See FAR part 4.6.

5. Ownership.

a. Type. Enter the type of ownership or legal structure of the firm (sole proprietor, partnership, corporation, joint venture, etc.).

b. Small Business Status. Refer to the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code in the public announcement, and indicate if the firm is a small business according to the current size standard for that NAICS code (for example, Engineering Services (part of NAICS 541330), Architectural Services (NAICS 541310), Surveying and Mapping Services (NAICS 541370)). The small business categories and the internet website for the NAICS codes appear in FAR part 19. Contact the requesting agency for any questions. Contact your local U.S. Small Business Administration office for any questions regarding Business Status.

6a-6c. Point of Contact. Provide this information for a representative of the firm that the agency can contact for additional information. The representative must be empowered to speak on contractual and policy matters.

7. Name of Firm. Enter the name of the firm if Part II is prepared for a branch office.

8a-8c. Former Firm Names. Indicate any other previous names for the firm (or branch office) during the last six years. Insert the year that this corporate name change was effective and the associated unique entity identifier. This information is used to review past performance on Federal contracts.

9. Employees by Discipline. Use the relevant disciplines and associated function codes shown at the end of these instructions and list in the same numerical order. After the listed disciplines, write in any additional disciplines and leave the function code blank. List no more than 20 disciplines. Group remaining employees under "Other Employees" in column b. Each person can be counted only once according to his/her primary function. If Part II is prepared for a firm (including all branch offices), enter the number of employees by disciplines in column c(1). If Part II is prepared for a branch office, enter the number of employees by discipline in column c(2) and for the firm in column c(1).

10. Profile of Firm's Experience and Annual Average Revenue for Last 5 Years. Complete this block for the firm or branch office for which this Part II is prepared. Enter the experience categories which most accurately reflect the firm's technical capabilities and project experience. Use the relevant experience categories and associated profile codes shown at the end of these instructions, and list in the same numerical order. After the listed experience categories, write in any unlisted relevant project experience categories and leave the profile codes blank. For each type of experience, enter the appropriate revenue index number to reflect the professional services revenues received annually (averaged over the last 5 years) by the firm or branch office for performing that type of work. A particular project may be identified with one experience category or it may be broken into components, as best reflects the capabilities and types of work performed by the firm. However, do not double count the revenues received on a particular project.

11. Annual Average Professional Services Revenues of Firm for Last 3 Years. Complete this block for the firm or branch office for which this Part II is prepared. Enter the appropriate revenue index numbers to reflect the professional services revenues received annually (averaged over the last 3 years) by the firm or branch office. Indicate Federal work (performed directly for the Federal Government, either as the prime contractor or subcontractor), non-Federal work (all other domestic and foreign work, including Federally-assisted projects), and the total. If the firm has been in existence for less than 3 years, see the definition for "Annual Receipts" under FAR 19.101.

12. Authorized Representative. An authorized representative of the firm or branch office must sign and date the completed form. Signing attests that the information provided is current and factual. Provide the name and title of the authorized representative who signed the form.



---

List of Disciplines (*Function Codes*)

---

Code	Description	Code	Description
01	Acoustical Engineer	32	Hydraulic Engineer
02	Administrative	33	Hydrographic Surveyor
03	Aerial Photographer	34	Hydrologist
04	Aeronautical Engineer	35	Industrial Engineer
05	Archeologist	36	Industrial Hygienist
06	Architect	37	Interior Designer
07	Biologist	38	Land Surveyor
08	CADD Technician	39	Landscape Architect
09	Cartographer	40	Materials Engineer
10	Chemical Engineer	41	Materials Handling Engineer
11	Chemist	42	Mechanical Engineer
12	Civil Engineer	43	Mining Engineer
13	Communications Engineer	44	Oceanographer
14	Computer Programmer	45	Photo Interpreter
15	Construction Inspector	46	Photogrammetrist
16	Construction Manager	47	Planner: Urban/Regional
17	Corrosion Engineer	48	Project Manager
18	Cost Engineer/Estimator	49	Remote Sensing Specialist
19	Ecologist	50	Risk Assessor
20	Economist	51	Safety/Occupational Health Engineer
21	Electrical Engineer	52	Sanitary Engineer
22	Electronics Engineer	53	Scheduler
23	Environmental Engineer	54	Security Specialist
24	Environmental Scientist	55	Soils Engineer
25	Fire Protection Engineer	56	Specifications Writer
26	Forensic Engineer	57	Structural Engineer
27	Foundation/Geotechnical Engineer	58	Technician/Analyst
28	Geodetic Surveyor	59	Toxicologist
29	Geographic Information System Specialist	60	Transportation Engineer
30	Geologist	61	Value Engineer
31	Health Facility Planner	62	Water Resources Engineer

List of Experience Categories (*Profile Codes*)

Code	Description	Code	Description
A01	Acoustics, Noise Abatement	E01	Ecological & Archeological Investigations
A02	Aerial Photography; Airborne Data and Imagery Collection and Analysis	E02	Educational Facilities; Classrooms
A03	Agricultural Development; Grain Storage; Farm Mechanization	E03	Electrical Studies and Design
A04	Air Pollution Control	E04	Electronics
A05	Airports; Nav aids; Airport Lighting; Aircraft Fueling	E05	Elevators; Escalators; People-Movers
A06	Airports; Terminals and Hangars; Freight Handling	E06	Embassies and Chanceries
A07	Arctic Facilities	E07	Energy Conservation; New Energy Sources
A08	Animal Facilities	E08	Engineering Economics
A09	Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection	E09	Environmental Impact Studies, Assessments or Statements
A10	Asbestos Abatement	E10	Environmental and Natural Resource Mapping
A11	Auditoriums & Theaters	E11	Environmental Planning
A12	Automation; Controls; Instrumentation	E12	Environmental Remediation
		E13	Environmental Testing and Analysis
B01	Barracks; Dormitories		
B02	Bridges	F01	Fallout Shelters; Blast-Resistant Design
		F02	Field Houses; Gyms; Stadiums
C01	Cartography	F03	Fire Protection
C02	Cemeteries ( <i>Planning &amp; Relocation</i> )	F04	Fisheries; Fish ladders
C03	Charting: Nautical and Aeronautical	F05	Forensic Engineering
C04	Chemical Processing & Storage	F06	Forestry & Forest products
C05	Child Care/Development Facilities		
C06	Churches; Chapels	G01	Garages; Vehicle Maintenance Facilities; Parking Decks
C07	Coastal Engineering	G02	Gas Systems (Propane; Natural, Etc.)
C08	Codes; Standards; Ordinances	G03	Geodetic Surveying: Ground and Air-borne
C09	Cold Storage; Refrigeration and Fast Freeze	G04	Geographic Information System Services: Development, Analysis, and Data Collection
C10	Commercial Building ( <i>low rise</i> ) ; Shopping Centers		
C11	Community Facilities	G05	Geospatial Data Conversion: Scanning, Digitizing, Compilation, Attributing, Scribing, Drafting
C12	Communications Systems; TV; Microwave		
C13	Computer Facilities; Computer Service	G06	Graphic Design
C14	Conservation and Resource Management		
C15	Construction Management	H01	Harbors; Jetties; Piers, Ship Terminal Facilities
C16	Construction Surveying	H02	Hazardous Materials Handling and Storage
C17	Corrosion Control; Cathodic Protection; Electrolysis	H03	Hazardous, Toxic, Radioactive Waste Remediation
C18	Cost Estimating; Cost Engineering and Analysis; Parametric Costing; Forecasting		
C19	Cryogenic Facilities	H04	Heating; Ventilating; Air Conditioning
		H05	Health Systems Planning
D01	Dams ( <i>Concrete; Arch</i> )	H06	Highrise; Air-Rights-Type Buildings
D02	Dams ( <i>Earth; Rock</i> ); Dikes; Levees	H07	Highways; Streets; Airfield Paving; Parking Lots
D03	Desalinization ( <i>Process &amp; Facilities</i> )		
D04	Design-Build - Preparation of Requests for Proposals	H08	Historical Preservation
D05	Digital Elevation and Terrain Model Development	H09	Hospital & Medical Facilities
D06	Digital Orthophotography	H10	Hotels; Motels
D07	Dining Halls; Clubs; Restaurants	H11	Housing ( <i>Residential, Multi-Family; Apartments; Condominiums</i> )
D08	Dredging Studies and Design	H12	Hydraulics & Pneumatics
		H13	Hydrographic Surveying

List of Experience Categories (*Profile Codes continued*)

Code	Description	Code	Description
I01	Industrial Buildings; Manufacturing Plants	P09	Product, Machine Equipment Design
I02	Industrial Processes; Quality Control	P10	Pneumatic Structures, Air-Support Buildings
I03	Industrial Waste Treatment	P11	Postal Facilities
I04	Intelligent Transportation Systems	P12	Power Generation, Transmission, Distribution
I05	Interior Design; Space Planning	P13	Public Safety Facilities
I06	Irrigation; Drainage	R01	Radar; Sonar; Radio & Radar Telescopes
J01	Judicial and Courtroom Facilities	R02	Radio Frequency Systems & Shieldings
L01	Laboratories; Medical Research Facilities	R03	Railroad; Rapid Transit
L02	Land Surveying	R04	Recreation Facilities (Parks, Marinas, Etc.)
L03	Landscape Architecture	R05	Refrigeration Plants/Systems
L04	Libraries; Museums; Galleries	R06	Rehabilitation (Buildings; Structures; Facilities)
L05	Lighting (Interior; Display; Theater, Etc.)	R07	Remote Sensing
L06	Lighting (Exteriors; Streets; Memorials; Athletic Fields, Etc.)	R08	Research Facilities
M01	Mapping Location/Addressing Systems	R09	Resources Recovery; Recycling
M02	Materials Handling Systems; Conveyors; Sorters	R10	Risk Analysis
M03	Metallurgy	R11	Rivers; Canals; Waterways; Flood Control
M04	Microclimatology; Tropical Engineering	R12	Roofing
M05	Military Design Standards	S01	Safety Engineering; Accident Studies; OSHA Studies
M06	Mining & Mineralogy	S02	Security Systems; Intruder & Smoke Detection
M07	Missile Facilities (Silos; Fuels; Transport)	S03	Seismic Designs & Studies
M08	Modular Systems Design; Pre-Fabricated Structures or Components	S04	Sewage Collection, Treatment and Disposal
N01	Naval Architecture; Off-Shore Platforms	S05	Soils & Geologic Studies; Foundations
N02	Navigation Structures; Locks	S06	Solar Energy Utilization
N03	Nuclear Facilities; Nuclear Shielding	S07	Solid Wastes; Incineration; Landfill
O01	Office Buildings; Industrial Parks	S08	Special Environments; Clean Rooms, Etc.
O02	Oceanographic Engineering	S09	Structural Design; Special Structures
O03	Ordnance; Munitions; Special Weapons	S10	Surveying; Platting; Mapping; Flood Plain Studies
P01	Petroleum Exploration; Refining	S11	Sustainable Design
P02	Petroleum and Fuel (Storage and Distribution)	S12	Swimming Pools
P03	Photogrammetry	S13	Storm Water Handling & Facilities
P04	Pipelines (Cross-Country - Liquid & Gas)	T01	Telephone Systems ( <i>Rural; Mobile; Intercom, Etc.</i> )
P05	Planning (Community, Regional, Areawide and State)	T02	Testing & Inspection Services
P06	Planning (Site, Installation, and Project)	T03	Traffic & Transportation Engineering
P07	Plumbing & Piping Design	T04	Topographic Surveying and Mapping
P08	Prisons & Correctional Facilities	T05	Towers ( <i>Self-Supporting &amp; Guyed Systems</i> )
		T06	Tunnels & Subways

---

List of Experience Categories *(Profile Codes continued)*

---

<b>Code</b>	<b>Description</b>
U01	Unexploded Ordnance Remediation
U02	Urban Renewals; Community Development
U03	Utilities (Gas and Steam)
V01	Value Analysis; Life-Cycle Costing
W01	Warehouses & Depots
W02	Water Resources; Hydrology; Ground Water
W03	Water Supply; Treatment and Distribution
W04	Wind Tunnels; Research/Testing Facilities Design
Z01	Zoning; Land Use Studies

# ARCHITECT - ENGINEER QUALIFICATIONS

## PART I - CONTRACT-SPECIFIC QUALIFICATIONS

### A. CONTRACT INFORMATION

1. TITLE AND LOCATION *(City and State)*

2. PUBLIC NOTICE DATE

3. SOLICITATION OR PROJECT NUMBER

### B. ARCHITECT-ENGINEER POINT OF CONTACT

4. NAME AND TITLE

5. NAME OF FIRM

6. TELEPHONE NUMBER

7. FAX NUMBER

8. E-MAIL ADDRESS

### C. PROPOSED TEAM

*(Complete this section for the prime contractor and all key subcontractors.)*

	(Check)						
	PRIME	J-V	PARTNER	SUBCON-TRACTOR	9. FIRM NAME	10. ADDRESS	11. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT
a.					<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
b.					<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
c.					<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
d.					<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
e.					<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		
f.					<input type="checkbox"/> CHECK IF BRANCH OFFICE		

### D. ORGANIZATIONAL CHART OF PROPOSED TEAM

☐ *(Attached)*

**E. RESUMES OF KEY PERSONNEL PROPOSED FOR THIS CONTRACT***(Complete one Section E for each key person.)*

12. NAME	13. ROLE IN THIS CONTRACT	14. YEARS EXPERIENCE	
		a. TOTAL	b. WITH CURRENT FIRM
15. FIRM NAME AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>			
16. EDUCATION <i>(Degree and Specialization)</i>		17. CURRENT PROFESSIONAL REGISTRATION <i>(State and Discipline)</i>	
18. OTHER PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS <i>(Publications, Organizations, Training, Awards, etc.)</i>			

**19. RELEVANT PROJECTS**

a.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
		<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
b.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
		<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
c.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
		<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
d.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
		<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	
e.	(1) TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(2) YEAR COMPLETED	
	(3) BRIEF DESCRIPTION <i>(Brief scope, size, cost, etc.)</i> AND SPECIFIC ROLE	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
		<input type="checkbox"/> Check if project performed with current firm	

<b>F. EXAMPLE PROJECTS WHICH BEST ILLUSTRATE PROPOSED TEAM'S QUALIFICATIONS FOR THIS CONTRACT</b> <i>(Present as many projects as requested by the agency, or 10 projects, if not specified. Complete one Section F for each project.)</i>		20. EXAMPLE PROJECT KEY NUMBER
21. TITLE AND LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	22. YEAR COMPLETED	
	PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	CONSTRUCTION <i>(If applicable)</i>
23. PROJECT OWNER'S INFORMATION		
a. PROJECT OWNER	b. POINT OF CONTACT NAME	c. POINT OF CONTACT TELEPHONE NUMBER
24. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT AND RELEVANCE TO THIS CONTRACT <i>(Include scope, size, and cost)</i>		

25. FIRMS FROM SECTION C INVOLVED WITH THIS PROJECT			
a.	(1) FIRM NAME	(2) FIRM LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(3) ROLE
b.	(1) FIRM NAME	(2) FIRM LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(3) ROLE
c.	(1) FIRM NAME	(2) FIRM LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(3) ROLE
d.	(1) FIRM NAME	(2) FIRM LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(3) ROLE
e.	(1) FIRM NAME	(2) FIRM LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(3) ROLE
f.	(1) FIRM NAME	(2) FIRM LOCATION <i>(City and State)</i>	(3) ROLE

[illegible]

## 29. EXAMPLE PROJECTS KEY

NUMBER	TITLE OF EXAMPLE PROJECT <i>(From Section F)</i>	NUMBER	TITLE OF EXAMPLE PROJECT <i>(From Section F)</i>
1		6	
2		7	
3		8	
4		9	
5		10	



---

**H. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

---

30. PROVIDE ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED BY THE AGENCY. ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NEEDED.

---

**I. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE**  
*The foregoing is a statement of facts.*

31. SIGNATURE	32. DATE
33. NAME AND TITLE	

## ARCHITECT-ENGINEER QUALIFICATIONS

1. SOLICITATION NUMBER (If any)

## PART II - GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS

(If a firm has branch offices, complete for each specific branch office seeking work.)

2a. FIRM (or Branch Office) NAME			3. YEAR ESTABLISHED	4. UNIQUE ENTITY IDENTIFIER
2b. STREET			5. OWNERSHIP	
2c. CITY			a. TYPE	
2d. STATE		2e. ZIP CODE	b. SMALL BUSINESS STATUS	
6a. POINT OF CONTACT NAME AND TITLE			7. NAME OF FIRM (If Block 2a is a Branch Office)	
6b. TELEPHONE NUMBER		6c. E-MAIL ADDRESS		
8a. FORMER FIRM NAME(S) (If any)			8b. YEAR ESTABLISHED	8c. UNIQUE ENTITY IDENTIFIER

[illegible]

<b>11. ANNUAL AVERAGE PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REVENUES OF FIRM FOR LAST 3 YEARS</b> <i>(Insert revenue index number shown at right)</i>		<b>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES REVENUE INDEX NUMBER</b>	
a. Federal Work		1. Less than \$100,000	6. \$2 million to less than \$5 million
b. Non-Federal Work		2. \$100,000 to less than \$250,000	7. \$5 million to less than \$10 million
c. Total Work		3. \$250,000 to less than \$500,000	8. \$10 million to less than \$25 million
		4. \$500,000 to less than \$1 million	9. \$25 million to less than \$50 million
		5. \$1 million to less than \$2 million	10. \$50 million or greater

## 12. AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE

*The foregoing is a statement of facts.*

a. SIGNATURE	b. DATE
c. NAME AND TITLE	



**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Michael Maddox & Anna Pierce  
**Date:** 02/06/2020  
**Re:** **MATBUS Transit Development Plan Consultant Selection**

The Fargo Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments (Metro COG) and the Cities of Moorhead and Fargo, under the Metro Area transit (MATBUS) banner are seeking professional consultant services to update the MATBUS Transit Development Plan. This update should integrate the recommendations of studies that have occurred in the last five years, as well as evaluate the impact of new service options, such as:

- Closed-door commuter service
- High-capacity/frequency corridors
- Localized demand response service
- Integrating arterial service options, and
- Other options that would increase and broaden transit service throughout the region.

The analysis of the transit system and subsequent recommendations could address items, such as:

- The use or implementation of new technologies not currently in use in the FM Area
- Utilizing different fleets to accomplish service demands
- New forms of transit service, or
- Other methods to address regional transportation needs from a public mass transit perspective.

In November 2019, Metro COG's Policy Board approved the Request for Proposal (RFP) to secure a consultant to complete the technical and planning tasks outlined in the scope of work under an approved project budget of \$200,000 (\$160,000 from Federal CPG funds and \$40,000 from local funds provided by the Cities of Moorhead and Fargo). Metro COG received *three* proposals prior to the submittal deadline on Tuesday, January 28, 2020.

The consultant selection panel reviewed the proposals and will interview all three consultant teams. After the writing of this memo, the consultant selection panel will meet with and interview the consultants on February 7 and 10, 2020 to further understand each team's technical qualifications, task deliverables, and past project experiences. The selection will be based upon scoring criteria, written technical proposals, and the in-person interviews.

Metro COG will send out a revised memo prior to the TTC meeting stating the recommended consulting team for the plan. This memo will also identify other teams that proposed on the project.

**Requested Action: Recommend Policy Board approval of the consulting team as recommended by the study's consultant selection panel and recommend Policy Board approval to enter into a contract negotiations with said consulting team for the MATBUS 2021-2025 Transit Development Plan.**

**To:** Transportation Technical Committee  
**From:** Luke Champa & Dan Farnsworth  
**Date:** 02/05/2020  
**Re:** **17<sup>th</sup> Street North Corridor Study Consultant Selection**

The Fargo Moorhead Metropolitan Council of Governments (Metro COG) and the City of Moorhead are seeking professional consultant services to conduct a transportation corridor study along 17<sup>th</sup> Street North in Moorhead. The study, extending from 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue North to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue North, will explore and evaluate different alternatives that would improve the corridor's aesthetics, multi-modal safety, traffic calming, bicycle facilities, quality of life, and more.

In October 2019, Metro COG's Policy Board approved the Request for Proposal (RFP) to secure a consultant to complete the technical and planning tasks outlined in the scope of work under an approved project budget of \$100,000 (\$80,000 from federal CPG funds and \$20,000 from local funds provided by Moorhead). Metro COG received seven proposals prior to the proposal deadline of Friday, January 24, 2020. The seven consultant teams were, Alta (sub KLJ), Apex (subs Stonebrooke, Flint Group, Hanson Design), Bolton & Menk (sub Toole Design), HDR, Houston (sub HKGi), SRF, and Ulteig (sub Sam Schwartz).

The consultant selection panel reviewed the proposals, and narrowed down the list from seven to *four* consultants, Alta (sub KLJ), Apex (subs Stonebrooke, Flint Group, Hanson Design), Bolton & Menk (sub Toole Design), HDR. After the writing of this memo, the selection panel will meet with and interview the four remaining consultants on February 12, 2020 to further understand each team's technical qualifications, task deliverables, and past project experiences. The selection will be based upon scoring criteria, written technical proposals, and the in-person interviews.

Metro COG will send out a revised memo prior to the TTC meeting stating the recommended consulting team for the plan.

**Requested Action: Recommend Policy Board approval of the consulting team as recommended by the study's consultant selection panel and recommend Policy Board approval to enter into a contract with said consulting team.**



**To:** Transportation Technical Committee (TTC)  
**From:** Adam Altenburg, AICP  
**Date:** February 6, 2020  
**Re:** **Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan Contract Amendment**

In December 2018, Metro COG contracted with Stantec for the completion of the Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan. The initial schedule indicated substantial project completion of the project by November 2019. This timeline was revised through a contract extension in September 2019, extending the project delivery schedule into the first quarter of 2020.

As the comprehensive plan neared completion, it became apparent that the project team lacked relevant development information which rendered recommendations and small area plans inaccurate and inconsistent with recently approved city plats and preliminary plats. In order to address these concerns, Stantec and the City of Horace have agreed upon a revised scope of work to review plats and development plans, revise two small area plans, and assess recommendations and implementation measures to ensure consistency with the rest of the plan.

Total cost for this amendment is \$14,973.60 with all of the funding provided as a local match by the City of Horace. No federal Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) funds will be used as part of this amendment and the project will continue to adhere to the project delivery schedule as revised in September 2019.

**Requested Action: Recommend Policy Board approval of the revised scope of work and fee; and amend the contract for completion of the Horace Comprehensive & Transportation Plan.**



**Stantec Consulting Services Inc.**  
2632 47th Street South, Suite 103  
Fargo, ND 58104-8571

February 6, 2020  
File: 193804411

**Attention: Adam Altenburg**  
Metro COG  
One 2<sup>nd</sup> Street North, Suite 232  
Fargo, ND 58102

Dear Adam,

**Reference: Addendum No. 2 for the Horace Comprehensive and Transportation Plan**

## Purpose of Addendum

The purpose of this amendment is to increase the project budget for the Horace Comprehensive and Transportation Plan. In recent meetings and discussions with the City Administrator, the P&Z Chair, and MetroCOG staff, it has been determined the comprehensive plan as currently drafted would not accurately reflect the continued development activity that has occurred throughout the study area. It is common—and Horace is no exception—for development projects to be in the works even as the city is trying to decide its future planned use and comprehensive plan. In this case, however, there have been multiple plats, either approved or preliminarily approved that impacted current recommendations for the Small Area Plans and were not communicated to Stantec at the time when the plans were being completed and reviewed.

Most of the original scope of work and meetings have been completed. To meet MetroCOG and Stantec's contractual agreement, proposed revisions are planned to be completed for final adoption early this spring.

## Scope of Services

A streamlined scope of additional work has been proposed to analyze and revise key aspects of the Comprehensive Plan and Small Area Plans that need attention. This effort will put the City in a position to move forward quickly but within the proper development context. Stantec proposes the following tasks in this addendum:

- Review plats, development plans, traffic studies and other available information pertinent to the Comprehensive Plan and Small Area Plans that have been preliminarily approved or approved as of February 3, 2020.
- Revise the 17/76 Small Area Plan and Old Town Small Area Plan to reflect new information including transportation framework, park and open space framework and design guidelines.
- Revise the existing Transportation and Small Area Plan draft chapters of the Comprehensive Plan to reflect new information.
- Conduct up to two meetings (by phone) with the City and MetroCOG staff to confirm small area plans and transportation recommendations.

**Reference:** Addendum No. 2 for the Horace Comprehensive and Transportation Plan

## Project Schedule

Our anticipated schedule for this work is as follows:

- February 13- MetroCOG present proposed addendum to MetroCOG TTC
- February 20- MetroCOG present proposed addendum to MetroCOG Policy Board
- February 27- Study Review Committee (SRC) meeting #4 to review final draft plan, Community Open House #4 to share final plan recommendations with residents.
- March 23- Stantec Presentation of the Comprehensive Plan to the Horace Park Board
- March 24- Stantec Presentation of the Comprehensive Plan to the Planning & Zoning Commission for review and recommendation.
- April 6- Stantec Presentation of the Comprehensive Plan to the Horace City Council for review and adoption.

Regards,

**Stantec Consulting Services Inc.**



---

**Wendy Van Duyne** PLA, ASLA, LEED AP  
Associate  
Phone: 701 333 8924  
Wendy.vanduyne@stantec.com

Attachment: Addendum No. 1 Cost Proposal Form for project extension

c. Project File

hp v:\1938\active\193804378\management\scopeschedulefee\contract addendum #1\20190710\_76thavescorridorstudy\_addendumno.1.v2.docx

## Summary of Estimated Project Cost - ADDENDUM Metro COG Horace Comprehensive Plan

1	Direct Labor		Hours	x	Rate	=	Project Cost	Total
	Dale Grove		0	x	\$77.26	=	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Peggy Harter		12	x	\$61.82	=	\$741.84	\$741.84
	Wendy Van Duyne		10	x	\$52.51	=	\$525.10	\$525.10
	Angie Bolstad		0	x	\$35.84	=	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Hongyi Duan		0	x	\$33.97	=	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Phil Carlson		54	x	\$59.05	=	\$3,188.70	\$3,188.70
	Joe Polacek		14	x	\$27.01	=	\$378.14	\$378.14
	Admin Support Staff		7	x	\$20.80		\$145.60	\$145.60
	Subtotal		97				\$4,979.38	\$4,979.38
2	Overhead/Indirect Cost						1.6849	\$8,389.91
3	Subcontractor Costs							
4	Material and Supplies Costs							
5	Travel Costs							
6	Fixed Fee						12.00%	\$1,604.31
7	Miscelaneous Costs							
Total Cost							\$14,973.60	