

SAFETEA-LU COMPLIANCE
CHANGES TO THE
GRAND FORKS – EAST GRAND FORKS
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
2004 ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODES PLAN ELEMENT

MARCH 2008

On August 10, 2005, President Bush signed the surface transportation reauthorization bill into law. This legislation – entitled the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The bill updates the total authorization of the federal transportation program. The Federal Transit Administration is one of the programs updated. The FTA provides significant funding to the transit services offered in Grand Forks and East Grand Forks. A couple of the biggest changes include provisions that will:

Achieve Common Sense Transit Solutions

- **Improve the coordination of transportation services** for the elderly, persons with disabilities, and low income individuals by requiring local communities to set community-wide funding priorities in a locally coordinated plan; providing for technical assistance and planning, along with administrative expenses; and permitting the use of other Federal funds (such as Medicaid or Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) as local match for FTA programs serving these groups.
- **Increase funding predictability and stability** by distributing more funds by formula, notably the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program.
- **Establish the New Freedom Program** to help communities provide transportation services beyond those required by ADA to help people with disabilities participate more fully in the workforce and in community life.

It is worth noting that many transit programs were largely unchanged by SAFETEA-LU. For example, the general program requirements for the Urbanized Area Formula (49 U.S.C. 5307), were not changed. This program is the program that Cities Area Transit (CAT) operates under the most. The new provisions such as JARC and New Freedom provide opportunities for CAT to enhance or expand their public transportation services.

Due to the adoption of SAFETEA-LU by the US Government, the Grand Forks – East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning Organization completed and adopted an amendment to the document in March 2007. Just as the amendment was being adopted, the federal agencies (FHWA and FTA) involved in transportation planning promulgated new rules that MPOs must follow in becoming compliant with SAFETE-LU. Hence, the MPO adopted a resolution in November 2007 to show compliance to SAFETEA-LU. The resolution was adopted with the provision of addressing any weakness identified by the review agencies in their review. This document highlights the modifications as identified as needing improvement.

This section focuses on the transit (CAT) section:

- Modifying goals to separate safety from security and stating a new, separate security goal.
- incorporating new funding estimates, including new funding sources from both federal and state programs
- updating service cost changes resulting after recommendations have been implemented
- incorporating the separate Human Services Public Transportation Coordinated Services Plan, adopted in 2006
- updating the recommendations and extending the timeframe out to 2012.

The following pages show the results of the modifications that were made.

Goal # 1 – Provide a Safe Transportation System

Objectives:

All Modes

- Preserve and maintain the existing transportation facilities.
 - Std. Pavement, signal systems, signage, striping, and other features of the transportation infrastructure which influence traffic movement should be maintained to a level which permits safe traffic operation.
 - Std. Review and update maintenance goals and objectives.
- Identify and incorporate available state Strategic Highway Safety Plans (SHSP) into Plan update.
 - Std. Recommended improvements should not conflict with the SHSPs of North Dakota and Minnesota.

Public Transit

- Provide safe on-board service.
 - Std. The number of bus crashes, as defined by the National Transit Database Reporting System, shall not exceed two per 100,000 bus miles.

Bikeway/Pedestrian

- Adopt a manual for bicycle/pedestrian facility design standards.
 - Std. Utilize Federal Highway Administration design standard guidelines.
 - Std. Utilize MNDOT design standard guidelines.
 - Std. Utilize AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle and Pedestrian guidelines.
- Reduce points of automobile conflicts with non-motorized traffic.
 - Std. Educate bicyclists, pedestrians and drivers of the rules of the road.
 - Std. Develop a bicycle and pedestrian friendly roadway environment.
 - Std. Implement for sidewalk locations per AASHTO standards in Table 1 below.
 - Std. Adopt guidelines for safe pedestrian crossings.
 - Std. Continue the use of easements as a means of providing a continuous network of pedestrian facilities.

Table 1. The following information was taken from: *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Street* (AASHTO, 2001). It summarizes guidelines for where to install sidewalks based on land use, roadway functional classification and, as applicable, type of dwelling unit. These guidelines, if followed, will establish a safer, more walkable community.

Types of areas (land-use, or roadway functional classification.)	Where do you need sidewalks with urban and suburban streets?
Commercial and industrial – all streets.	On both sides of these streets.
Residential – arterials.	On both sides of these streets.
Residential – collectors.	Required on one side, but preferred on both sides.
Residential – local streets	Required on one side, but preferred on both sides.
Residential streets with access to schools, parks, shopping areas, and transit stops.	On both sides of these streets.

Notes:

1. You may omit a sidewalk on one side of any new street when that side of the street clearly cannot be developed, and when there are no uses or planned uses for that side of the street that would encourage people to walk there.
2. When a main road has a service road, you may eliminate the sidewalk next to the main road if you replace it with a sidewalk on the far side of the service road.

- Reduce bike/pedestrian – auto accidents by 2%, and increase bike helmet use by 3% each year.

Std. Seek repeal of state and local laws which state that whenever a usable path for bicycles has been provided adjacent to a roadway, bicycle riders shall use such paths and shall not use the roadway.

Std. Include bicycle and pedestrian accidents in the monitoring & surveillance report.

Std. Annually identify and remove hazards to bicycle and pedestrian travel as part of maintenance program.

Std. Include bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of Traffic Safety Management.

Std. Request that police reports include information on bicycle helmet use in accident reports.

Std. Survey bicycle helmet use in the G.F. /E.G.F. Metropolitan area.

Std. Request support from health institutions in order to obtain information on bicycle and pedestrian accidents and injuries not reported to police.

1

- Adopt uniform bicycle/pedestrian traffic control devices.

Std. Utilize Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT) Manual on traffic control devices.

Std. Utilize uniform manual on traffic control devices.

- Enforce existing laws relating to bicycles and pedestrians.

- Std. Develop local enforcement programs to target key violations and locations of bicyclists and drivers involved.
 - Std. Encourage the use of bicycle patrols by local police departments in urban areas to provide a good example of bicycling conduct.
 - Std. Develop specific procedures for dealing with young violators.
 - Std. Monitor the number, location, and type of issued citations/warnings related to bicycles.
 - Std. Promote local licensing/registration programs to assist in deterring bicycle theft.
 - Std. Emphasize enforcement of posted automobile speed limits on roadways with designated bike and pedestrian facilities.
 - Std. Enforce ordinance on Parking Near Intersections and Crosswalks.
- Implement bike and pedestrian safety education programs at the local level.
 - Std. Include a bike and pedestrian safety section in the driver education program.
 - Std. Teach basic bike and pedestrian safety to children in Kindergarten through grade 3.
 - Std. Implement school safety patrol program in Grand Forks.
 - Std. Participate in National Bike and Pedestrian Safety Weeks.

Goal #8 – Provide a Secure Transportation System

Objectives:

- Coordinate Transportation Plan with flood control operations during flood events
 - Std. Compatibility with current flood control operations planning.
- Identify and incorporate state and regional emergency, evacuation, and security plans into Plan update
 - Std. Improvement projects should enhance/compliment existing emergency, evacuation and security plans.
 - Std. Review and update external operating procedures with local emergency agencies.
- Provide a secure transit system
 - Std. Review and update internal safety and security manual and training.
 - Std. Ensure 1 percent of Federal funds are spent for transit security projects.

3.7 FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the metropolitan financial analysis for the fixed route, dial-a-ride, and senior rider operating systems for the five-year planning period (2007 through 2012). The analysis includes both forecasted revenues, and expenses, as anticipated by Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, and is based on Section 3.4 Alternatives Analysis and projected public subsidies. Public subsidies for both systems are primarily through the United States Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The current federal funding mechanism is the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), which needs to be re-authorized and has been extended until re-authorization occurs. *In late 2005, reauthorization occurred with the adoption of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). With passage, updated financial information is known and this analysis must be updated.*

Table 3.29 summarizes the projected federal operating funding for the urbanized area through 2009. Federal funding for transit service is expected to remain steady each successive year during the five-year planning period. Potential re-authorization bills considered by Congress suggested healthy increases; however, these bills have not been passed and new revenue projections place doubt whether the healthy increase can materialize. Therefore, we predict a continuation of the most recent trend, which was a steady funding stream at the federal level. Funding has actually decreased for the last couple of years but, the percentage is less than -0.01%. *SAFETEA-LU authorized a 5% increase in funding levels during the later years of its authorization. The bill is pending renewal in 2009. The following table has been updated to reflect these increases. The Table has been extended through 2012.*

TABLE 3.29

Table 3.29a U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration Grand Forks, ND-MN Urbanized Area Funding (5307 Urban Formula Program)						
Category	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
GF Funding Level	\$748,274	\$785,687	\$824,971	\$866,220	\$909,531	\$955,008
Change from Previous Year	n/a	\$37,414	\$39,284	\$41,249	\$43,311	\$45,477
Percent Change from Previous Year	n/a	+5%	+5%	+5%	+5%	+5%

Table 3.29b U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration Grand Forks, ND-MN Urbanized Area Funding (5307 Urban Formula Program)						
Category	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
EGF Funding Level	\$100,558	\$105,586	\$110,865	\$116,408	\$122,228	\$128,339
Change from Previous Year	n/a	\$5,028	\$5,280	\$5,543	\$5,820	\$6,111
Percent Change from Previous Year	n/a	+5%	+5%	+5%	+5%	+5%

Table 3.29c U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration Grand Forks, ND-MN Urbanized Area Funding (5307 Urban Formula Program)						
Category	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Metro Fund Level	\$848,832	\$891,273	\$935,836	\$982,628	\$1,031,759	\$1,083,347
Change from Previous Year	n/a	\$42,442	\$44,564	\$46,792	\$49,131	\$51,588
Percent Change From Previous Year	n/a	+5%	+5%	+5%	+5%	+5%

SAFETEA-LU also authorized new federal funding programs or dramatically altered how some funding programs appropriated money. Two programs of significance to the metro area are the New Freedom Program (5316) and the Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC) Program (5317). With these new programs, FTA ignited the process for all Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) to look at their transit needs and current services. Of utmost importance was the desire to assess the current transportation environment, to see where the coordination of services is in place, and to assess where there might be opportunities for additional improvements. The SAFETEA-LU legislation mandates that all urbanized areas must adopt a “locally developed” coordinated transportation plan in order to receive these program grants beginning in the Federal fiscal year of 2007. The Cities of Grand Forks and East Grand Forks, together with the MPO, prepared and adopted a plan earlier this year. The Coordinated Plan is hereby incorporated, by reference, into this Transit Development Plan. The intent of the coordination requirement ensures that communities coordinate transportation resources and services provided through multiple Federal programs. Ultimately a coordinated plan should minimize duplication of Federal services and encourage the most cost-effective transportation possible.

New Freedom is a new formula program appropriated to the states of Minnesota and North Dakota as the designated recipient of the funds and the MPO applies to each state. The MPO will then enter with other small urban areas in the two states into a competitive selection process.

Projects eligible for New Freedom funding must be new public transportation services and beyond those required by ADA. The project must target people with disabilities and remove barriers to transit. For instance, if ADA requires complementary service with a range of ¾ mile on each side of fixed route, service beyond that distance would be eligible for New Freedom funding. New service can be additional routes primarily for the disabled or renovations to existing transportation facilities. The renovations can not be part of an already planned renovation or alteration.

Eligible Projects: New Service (routes or service); environmental modifications (signage, curb cuts) beyond required in ADA; technologies to enhance customer access; Beyond ADA: expanded hours for paratransit, beyond ¾ mile, same day service, door through door, flex route for commuter bus; administration of vouchers, administration of volunteer programs, travel training, and mobility management.

The Job Access Reverse Commute grant program has been historically a discretionary program but recently was changed to a formula grant program. The purpose of this program is to improve transportation services designed to serve those below 150 percent of the federal poverty level.

Emphasis is put on projects that use mass transportation. States receive money for large urban areas (population over 200,000), small urban areas (population between 50,000-200,000), and rural areas. The match is set at 50/50 for operating expenses and 80/20 for capital expenses. The local match can be met with other federal funds.

Eligible Projects: Late-night and weekend service, guaranteed ride home services, shuttle service, expanding fixed-route transit routes, demand-responsive van service, ridesharing and carpooling activities, bicycling, local car loan programs, and promotion through marketing efforts of use of transit by workers with non-traditional work schedules, use of transit vouchers, development of employer-provided transportation such as shuttles, and ridesharing.

Funding from these programs is appropriated to the State. As shown in Table 3.3.1a, the funding became available in 2006 and has authorized levels until 2009. Any project funded from these programs are competitively selected across the States, with more likelihood of significant funding coming from the North Dakota side of our metro area. Therefore, the Minnesota funds are not shown.

TABLE 3.3.1a

Table 3.3.1a U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration Grand Forks, ND-MN Urbanized Area Funding (5316 New Freedom Program)						
Category	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
ND Funding Level	\$90,928	\$98,225	\$103,838	\$109,030	\$114,481	\$120,205
Change from Previous Year	n/a	\$7,297	\$5,613	\$5,192	\$5,451	\$5,724
Percent Change from Previous Year	n/a	+8%	+5.7%	+5%	+5%	+5%

Table 3.3.1c U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration Grand Forks, ND-MN Urbanized Area Funding (5317 Job Access Reverse Commute Program)						
Category	FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
ND Funding Level	\$174,497	\$189,038	\$199,338	\$209,305	\$219,770	\$230,760
Change from Previous Year	n/a	\$14,541	\$10,300	\$9,967	\$10,465	\$10,990
Percent Change from Previous Year	n/a	+8.3%	+5.5%	+5%	+5%	+5%

ND State Funding

Another significant change occurred since the original adoption of this Transit Development Plan impacting the financial analysis section. During the 2005 Legislative Session, North Dakota increased the fee on vehicle registrations. These registration fees are distributed to various accounts and entities. The transit operations through out the state had an increase in the amount per vehicle registration going to the transit. For Grand Forks, the increase was from around \$50,000 received annually from this North Dakota program to over \$230,000. This is not a one-time windfall; but an annual increase. These funds can be used to match the increase in federal funds or fund any other transit related service item, including capital.

3.7.3 RECOMMENDED PLAN OPERATING FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

Table 3.32 reveals the financial forecast as a result of implementing the recommendations of this plan. As can be seen the system begins to accumulate funds immediately if all of the recommendations are in place; in other words, the financial crisis is resolved immediately. The recommendations are transferring the Trippers services to outside providers, negotiating a new cost basis for demand response, and combining the Senior Rider and Dial-A-Rider into one demand response service.

The plan recognizes that as the metropolitan area grows, the services must grow as well. The recommended actions place the Cities Area Transit in a position of having built up revenues that could allow the services to grow, specifically the fixed route system. The possibility of adding two additional routes seems real. One would serve the area south of 32nd Avenue South in Grand Forks, and the other would serve the growing areas on the western edge of Grand Forks, i.e. 42nd Street corridor and Industrial Park expansion.

A study was conducted in FY2007 to establish the recommended service for the possible expansion. The Study Report for the CAT Service Expansion more fully documents the analysis and other service options considered. A serious attempt was made to expand into the Grand Forks Industrial Park. Several opportunities and service options were detailed to the area's employers. A trial route was offered for free rides. However, extremely few employees used the service despite the heavy marketing of the service. The result was to focus on expansion along S. 42nd Street and the growing area south of 32nd Ave. The new expansion route is known as "Route 12/13" See map on next page.

**TABLE 3.32
Financial Forecast As A Result Of Implementing Transit Plan**

City of Grand Forks Public Transit Budget							
		FY 2007	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Expenses	City Bus	1,486,510.00	1,560,835.50	1,638,877.28	1,720,821.14	1,772,445.77	1,825,619.15
	DAR/SR	364,671.00	371,964.42	379,403.71	386,991.78	398,601.54	410,559.58
	Capital	36,200.00	60,000.00	115,600.00	102,000.00	102,000.00	102,000.00
	JARC/NF	200,000.00	200,000.00	200,000.00	NA	NA	NA
	Total	\$ 2,087,381.00	\$ 2,192,799.92	\$ 2,333,880.98	\$ 2,209,812.92	\$ 2,273,047.31	\$ 2,338,178.73
Revenues	City Bus	356,836.08	360,404.44	364,008.49	367,648.57	378,678.03	390,038.37
	DAR/SR	8,896.31	8,985.27	9,075.13	9,165.88	9,440.85	9,724.08
	Federal*	746,704.00	784,039.20	823,241.16	864,403.22	907,623.38	953,004.55
	State	252,000.00	264,600.00	277,830.00	291,721.50	306,307.58	321,622.95
	Local Mill	705,147.00	\$740,404	\$777,425	\$816,296	\$857,111	\$899,966
	JARC/NF	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00			
Total	\$ 2,169,583.39	\$ 2,258,433.26	\$ 2,351,579.34	\$ 2,349,234.96	\$ 2,459,160.42	\$ 2,574,356.06	
Deficit/Surplus		\$82,202.39	\$65,633.34	\$17,698.36	\$139,422.04	\$186,113.11	\$236,177.34
				carryover	\$304,956.13	\$408,866.85	\$579,410.84

*Fed, State & Local assumed at 5% increase

For East Grand Forks, the plan recommendations directly impact the costs of the required paratransit service. The reduction in the cost basis should reduce East Grand Forks' expenditures. The provision of the Dial-A-Ride is directly contracted by East Grand Forks with the providers; therefore the recommended lower cost basis is a direct impact rather than indirect as fixed route changes are.

Map of 12/13

CAPITAL

Essentially, there are two types of capital items in transit: rolling stock and buildings. Rolling stock includes the fixed route buses and the mini-buses and vans providing the demand response services (DAR and Senior Rider). In addition to these operation vehicles, rolling stock also includes staff vehicles and maintenance vehicles. The other type of capital items are the maintenance facility (Bus Barn), Metro Transit Center and passenger shelters at various locations throughout the metro area.

Funds for capital purchase come from a variety of programs. Although the FTA 5307 program funds can be used for capital, Grand Forks must use these funds for operating expenditures. This is a common trait for the other urban areas of North Dakota. Therefore, the three North Dakota urban areas and the State of North Dakota have implemented a successful campaign to receive FTA 5309 discretionary funds for capital purchases. This funding source has been deemed reliable, and has been identified as the source of federal funds for capital purchases in North Dakota. The one major problem is that the total statewide funding request has typically not been awarded so each transit operator only receives a pro rata share of the request. This pushes back the actual year that the identified capital purchase can be obligated. The federal funds are typically an 83/17 match ratio for vehicles, and 80/20 for other capital. The local match is usually provided through the CAT mill levy or other general revenue sources.

East Grand Forks has more flexibility in securing funding sources for capital purchases. As detailed in the operating section, the FTA 5307 funds for East Grand Forks is enough to allow reliance on some left over for capital after the maximum has been utilized for operating. In addition to these federal funds, the State of Minnesota transfers some federal highway funds towards transit capital. These funds are awarded through the Minnesota area transportation partnership, which East Grand Forks utilized for the last vehicle purchase in 2002.

The long-term (20-year horizon) financial outlook for Cities Area Transit is difficult to forecast accurately. Given the forecast growth discussed in Section 2.4, it can be reasonably assumed that there will be some desire to serve the growing areas. It is anticipated that as many as two new routes/service areas may be added; one to serve the area south of 32nd Avenue in Grand Forks, and the other to serve the western portion of Grand Forks. Fortunately, the recommended route structure should be able to easily accommodate service expansion, with existing facilities serving as mini-transfer locations. Thus, the significant increases in future expenses will be due to adding an additional two buses to the fleet (capital expense), and hiring at least two more bus driver shifts (operating expense). The majority of CAT revenue comes from government subsidy and self generating revenues (i.e., farebox, advertising, etc.). It is impossible to know what funding levels will be available so far into the future, but if the current trend continues after the plan recommendations are implemented, it can be reasonably expected that CAT will be able to maintain financial health.

COORDINATION

SAFETEA-LU mandates that all urbanized areas must adopt a “locally developed” coordinated transportation plan in order to receive additional Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants as of the 2007 Federal fiscal year. The MPO prepared and adopted such a plan for 2006-2009. The plan was developed by involving the metropolitan area’s human services agencies. This Coordinated Transportation Plan makes the metropolitan area of Grand Forks – East Grand Forks eligible for FTA Section 5310, 5316, and 5317 funding grants.

In order to measure the success of the Coordination Plan, the MPO has adopted the following list of desired outcomes:

- coordinated agencies;
- reduced duplication of services;
- increased transit ridership by target groups;
- customer satisfaction;
- available capacity;
- efficient service;
- affordable transportation; and
- accessible transportation.

The intent of the coordination requirement is to ensure that communities coordinate transportation resources and services provided through multiple Federal programs. Ultimately a coordinated plan should minimize duplication of Federal services and encourage the most cost-effective transportation possible.

3.8 RECOMMENDED IMPLEMENTATION

The recommendations identified above have varying lead times toward implementation, and in some cases are dependent upon one another. This section presents a framework for implementing the recommendations for each year within the five-year planning horizon.

Year 2006

- **Purchase replacement vehicles and improvements/upgrades to Bus Barn.**

Continue participation in North Dakota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request. Use the standard vehicle replacement schedule with emphasis on low-floor vehicles at medium duty type for fixed route. Continue repair/replacement and upgrades of “Bus Barn”. City of East Grand Forks participates with demand response rolling stock replacement. East Grand Forks begins process of becoming included in Minnesota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request.

- **Monitor operations.**

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

Prepare and adopt amendment to this document reflecting the changes required by the new Transportation Reauthorization bill – SAFETEA-LU.

Prepare and adopt the Coordinated Public Transportation/Human Services Transportation Plan. After adoption, amend this TDP to include it by reference.

Apply for funding from the New Freedom and Job Access Reverse Commute programs to extend service to the 42nd Street area and the Industrial Park area, to begin Saturday service at earlier hours, and to provide limited service on Sundays.

- **Upgrade Shelters**

Based upon the study outcome, begin implementing enhancements to identified shelters.

Year 2007

- **Purchase replacement vehicles and improvements/upgrades to Bus Barn.**

Continue participation in North Dakota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request. Use the standard vehicle replacement schedule with emphasis on low-floor vehicles at medium duty type for fixed route. Continue repair/replacement and upgrades of “Bus Barn”. City of East Grand Forks participates with demand response

rolling stock replacement. East Grand Forks continues process of becoming included in Minnesota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request.

- **Upgrade Shelters**

Continue implementation of Bus Shelter Enhancement Study recommendations

- **Monitor operations.**

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

With funding received from the new FTA programs and the increased apportionment of 5307 program funds, implement the expansion of services (see map of proposed Route 12/13 applied through the 2006 applications. Any capital requirements to implement these services are to come from the FTA 5309 program.

Year 2008

- **Purchase replacement vehicles and improvements/upgrades to Bus Barn.**

Continue participation in North Dakota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request. Use the standard vehicle replacement schedule with emphasis on low-floor vehicles at medium duty type for fixed route. Continue repair/replacement and upgrades of “Bus Barn”. City of East Grand Forks participates with demand response rolling stock replacement. East Grand Forks continues process of becoming included in Minnesota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request.

- **Upgrade Shelters**

Continue implementation of Bus Shelter Enhancement Study recommendations

- ~~**Adopt Update to Five Year Transit Development Plan**~~

~~Cooperatively work with the MPO and State DOTs to update the Transit Section of the Year 2035 Metropolitan Long Range Transportation Plan.~~

- **Monitor operations.**

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

Map of Route 12/13

Year 2009

- ***Purchase replacement vehicles and improvements/upgrades to Bus Barn.***

Continue participation in North Dakota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request. Use the standard vehicle replacement schedule with emphasis on low-floor vehicles at medium duty type for fixed route. Continue repair/replacement and upgrades of “Bus Barn”. City of East Grand Forks participates with demand response rolling stock replacement. East Grand Forks continues process of becoming included in Minnesota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request.

- ***Monitor operations.***

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

Year 2010

- ***Purchase replacement vehicles and improvements/upgrades to Bus Barn.***

Continue participation in North Dakota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request. Use the standard vehicle replacement schedule with emphasis on low-floor vehicles at medium duty type for fixed route. Continue repair/replacement and upgrades of “Bus Barn”. City of East Grand Forks participates with demand response rolling stock replacement. East Grand Forks continues process of becoming included in Minnesota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request.

- ***Monitor operations.***

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

Year 2011

- ***Purchase replacement vehicles and improvements/upgrades to Bus Barn.***

Continue participation in North Dakota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request. Use the standard vehicle replacement schedule with emphasis on low-floor vehicles at medium duty type for fixed route. Continue repair/replacement and upgrades of “Bus Barn”. City of East Grand Forks participates with demand response rolling stock replacement. East Grand Forks continues process of becoming included in Minnesota FTA #5309 statewide capital assistance request.

- ***Begin Data Collection in order to Update to Five Year Transit Development Plan***
- ***Monitor operations.***

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

Year 2012

- *Adopt Update to Five Year Transit Development Plan*

Cooperatively work with the MPO and State DOTs to update the Transit Section of the Year 2035 Metropolitan Long Range Transportation Plan.

- *Monitor operations.*

Consider adjustments, as necessary, based upon the financial performance of the system and available resources.

4.11 IMPLEMENTATION AND STAGING PLAN

4.11.1 Projects By Time Period:

Under current regulation, all new roads and streets utilizing federal funds, except where bikes are legally prohibited, should be designed and constructed for bicycles. Since the majority of existing roadways have not been designed with the bicycle travel in mind, the reconstruction of roads will require changes to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian travel. The reconstruction of a roadway will dictate when the bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be constructed for that area.

All bikeway projects were broken down into time periods for completion. The short-term projects should be completed by 2010. Nearly all routes and lanes are considered short-term projects due to their relatively small cost. The Capital Improvements Plan (CIP), a six-year plan for the city of Grand Forks, will reflect these projects in the coming years. The planned structures to be completed in this time period include the underpass at 42nd Street, and the shared use river crossings at Riverside and 17th Avenue South. The only planned structure in this same period for East Grand Forks, is the 4th Street NW shared use underpass between the State Campground and Sherlock Park.

The two shared use river crossings were built and became operational in 2007. The underpass at 42nd Street has been delayed out to the long term period. The underpass of 4th Street NW was modified to an at-grade improvement to the crossing with final implementation due to be completed in 2008. Rather than an underpass, embedded lights in the pavement will illuminate the crossing as users cross the street.

The mid-term projects should be completed by 2020. Projects considered for this time are along existing roadways within the city and anticipate funding in the future. The planned structures include the crossing at Merrifield Road, and the extension/ reconstruction of s. 48th Street.

The long-term projects should be completed by 2035. These projects are usually along the peripheries of the towns on roads that are to be built in the future. The planned structures for this time period include the 32nd Avenue river crossing, 17th Ave Interstate crossing, 34th Street shared use overpass, downtown shared use river crossing, and the East Grand Forks extension of 2nd Avenue NE (Central Spine). It should be noted that the timelines for short, mid, and long-term projects are dependent on the availability of funding.

Table 4.8 shows cost estimates for the above projects. Structure costs are based from existing bids and estimates. Path estimates are based on \$30 per lineal foot, which is consistent with costs of current projects. These costs are in 2004 dollars and could increase in the future.

TABLE 4.8

Bikeway Cost by Project Period

<i>Short Term Projects</i>	
Riverside Shared Use Bridge	\$2,650,000
17 th Avenue Shared Use Bridge	\$2,650,000
42 nd Street Underpass	\$67,500

4 th Street Shared Use Embedded lights (EGF)	\$85,000
Planned Bike Lanes	\$134,534
Planned Bike Routes	\$49,674
Total	\$5,776,708
<i>Mid Term Projects</i>	
Merrifield River Crossing	\$40,500
48 th Street Reconstruction/Extension	\$316,800
Total	\$357,300
<i>Long Term Projects</i>	
32 nd Avenue River Crossing	\$72,000
42 nd Street Underpass	\$67,500
17 th Avenue Interstate Crossing	\$79,500
Downtown Shared Use River Crossing	\$1,500,000
34 th Street Shared Use Overpass	\$1,625,000
Total	\$3,276,500

The figures above give the total cost of the bikeway plan broken down by time period. The short term cost accounts for about 74% of the total bikeway network. Obviously the two bike/pedestrian bridges, which are part of the flood protection project, account for the high percentage. The costs of bike and pedestrian structures as standalone projects are much more noticeable than when facilities are combined with roadway projects. The vast majority of the short, mid, long-term projects would be federally funded through the construction and reconstruction roadway projects. As stated before, federal regulations require that all modes of transportation, including bicycle and pedestrian, be accommodated if federal funds are used for the project.