



RECORD OF MEETING

SRF Project No.

Project/Meeting Name: Central Dakota MPO Transit Development Plan

Date: November 12, 2025

Time: 2:30 PM

Location: Minot City Hall, Finance Conference Room, 2nd floor & MS Teams

Attendees: See Attendance List Below

Purpose of Meeting

Transit Development Plan Steering Committee Meeting #2

Summary of Meeting

Attendance:

- John Van Dyke
- Brian Horinka
- Barry Brooks
- Doug Diedrichsen
- Mark Lyman (Minot Chamber)
- Mike Blessum (City Council)
- Tim Baumann (online)
- Brandon Syracuse (SRF; online)
- Bill Troe (SRF; online)
- Jacob Conner (SRF; online)

Meeting Notes

Introductions

- All attendees introduced themselves

Approval of Steering Committee Meeting #1 Minutes

- Mike Blessum moved to approve the Steering Committee Meeting #1 minutes; seconded by Mark Lyman; ayes: John Van Dyke, Brian Horinka, Barry Brooks, Doug Diedrichsen, Mark Lyman, Mike Blessum, Tim Baumann; nays: none.

Goals

- Bill introduced the draft goals, determined from looking at the last transit study and analyzing the SWOT Analysis input
- Bill reviewed the goals from the 2013 Transit Study
 - Many are still applicable (accessibility, quality of service, multimodal approach, transit experience, and funding)
 - Some may not be applicable anymore (development and land use, environment and air quality)
 - Brian Horinka: this transit plan was conducted back during the oil boom, when lots of growth was happening. This is why the development and land use goal was included. Then the oil boom slowed. Minot also doesn't have an air quality problem. I'd like to remove the air quality goal and possibly reword the development and land use goal)
 - Tim Baumann: I'm okay with removing goal 4, as the city buses we have are probably the most detrimental to air quality. I appreciate the development and land use goal, though the old goal is slightly outdated. Development and land use goals should be more about accessibility.
 - Bill: we could also augment goal #2 to include language about maintaining the fleet in a state of good repair to reduce air quality impacts.
 - Mark: what about a goal of growing the service appropriately as land use patterns change?
 - Bill: Revised goal #3 would integrate transit into development planning
 - Brian likes this revised goal. Transit was never part of development planning in the past, so it would be good to start doing this. Example: Walmart on 37th Avenue was built out really well, but it's missing sidewalks and transit was an afterthought. It was a huge challenge for Minot Transit to figure out how to get people from buses to the building. Transit has been getting a little more involved in development lately, and this should be continued.
 - John: with removing environmental regulations, are there any CFR rules that require us to consider environmental components?
 - Bill: I'll go back in and look at this, but unlikely.
- Bill reviewed the SWOT results from the last steering committee meeting.

- Bill introduced the draft goals, which are a composite from the 2013 plan and SWOT:
 - Accessibility
 - Quality of Service (add some language about state of good repair)
 - Integrate Transit into Development Planning
 - Safety and Security (Jacob: add some language about safety and security on board vehicles and at facilities as well)
 - Transit Experience (Jacob: add some language about fares and fare systems)
 - Funding
- Steering Committee members generally like the draft goals and suggested additions.
- Brian: fares have not been raised on a while. The most recent update was raising day fares from \$4 to \$5 about 5-6 years ago.
 - Mark(?): Should we have fares at all? What are the ramifications of going to zero fare? If we can offset the \$80,000 fare revenue and improve metrics like ridership? Would prefer to consider lowering or eliminating fares before we consider raising fares.
 - Brian: the legislature views fare-charging agencies more favorably. Free fares can also result in the buses becoming de facto homeless shelters. Can have policies to counteract this, but it puts more of a burden on drivers. The state also requires the transit agency to count senior and disabled riders, and fares are the only way we can do that now. We also have to count student riders. APC systems don't have the ability to do this.
 - Mark: reducing the burden of jumping through hoops to appease legislature and funders can also be a cost. I view the cost of providing free fares as less than the benefits provided by free fares.
 - If you want to have a fee, it also needs to be easy for the customer to pay
- In general, we also need to make it easier to ride the bus. Right now, it can be difficult. You go to the ATM and get a \$20 bill, you put the bill in the farebox, you get a ticket but you don't get any change. How do you get that change back?
- Fare structure needs to be incorporated into goals somehow.
 - If we need to do that, can we look at pros and cons of fare-free?

- Bill: this is already included in the scope
- Bill: we will do some updating. We'll put the goals into a survey monkey form and the SC members can provide some comments.
- Bill talked about the anticipated outcomes of meeting goals:
 - Customers see they are put first
 - Convenience – service supports needs
 - Transit is considered in development/growth
 - Service is coordinated across agencies

Look Forward

- Bill showed maps of data that we will use to help with service planning
 - Evaluating productivity of routes
 - Evaluating need to re-design routes, implement microtransit, etc.

Next Steps:

- Review Assessment of Current Services
- Reviewing Funding
- Paratransit

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:00pm.