

## **Meeting of the Central Corridor Business Advisory Committee December 17, 2007**

### Meeting Minutes

**Members Present:** Karri Plowman, Lori Fritts, Kay Baker, Sharon Johnson, Harry Melander, David Youmans, Tom Olesck, Julio Fesser, Brian Thoemke, Jim Roth, Jeannine Kessler

**Members Absent:** Sondra Reis, Kathy Bjerke, Brenda Kyle, Peter Latuff, Denise Currie, Ken Hinz, David Jones, Guy Mingo, Chang Thao, Nell McClung, Tanya Bell, Christine Wiegert, Khue Yang,

**Others Present:** Mark Fuhrmann, Chuck Hymes, Harvey Jaeger, Dan Soler, Robin Cauffman, Dana Dellis, Linda Jungwirth, Rita Rodriguez, Steve Morris, Art Carlson, Shoua Lee, Carol Kuhl, B. Kyle, VaMegn Thoj.

#### **1. Welcome**

Brief welcome by Lori Fritts, Co-Chair Business Advisory Committee

#### **2. Introductions**

Committee members introduced themselves and were asked to tell the location of their business or property they owned or operated.

#### **3. Metropolitan Council Update:**

Mark Fuhrmann, Project Director, reported that the Central Corridor Management Committee discussed on the following at their Dec. 12 meeting:

#### **4. Project Updates**

**Downtown Saint Paul Alignment.** Mr. Fuhrmann reviewed alignment alternatives in Downtown St. Paul. The Metropolitan Council agreed to look at several options that would bring the Central Corridor LRT behind the Union Depot to have intermodal transferability.

Mr. Fuhrmann discussed the operating cost, travel time difference and CEI impacts for each of the alignments compared to the original route shown in the DEIS and responded to questions.

#### **Q: Is ridership part of the CEI equation?**

A: Yes. Ridership model is driven by region and where people live and work and reflects ridership trends and future growth.

#### **Q: What is meant by amenities?**

A: Elevators, stairs, vertical connections, connections to skyway.

#### **Q: Is there an impact on district energy?**

A: Diagonal avoids conflict with District Energy pipes at 4<sup>th</sup> and Cedar.

**Q: Why not stop in front of the Depot?**

A: Seamless transfer between future LRT, buses connections and Amtrak trains at the concourse.

**The Infill stations study for Hamline, Victoria and Western.** Next. Mr. Fuhrmann reviewed the findings of the Hamline, Victoria, Western study included the following:

- Reduction in corridor rider-ship by 400
- Does not change Midway rider-ship
- Increases travel time and cost of \$5.5M per station

Mr. Fuhrmann indicated that the findings of the Hamline, Victoria, and Western stations may have a significant impact on reducing rider ship because increased travel time will discourage passengers from boarding a longer trip. Thus, increasing the project Cost Effectiveness Index (CEI) by \$.28-.50. He reminded committee members that we need to keep CEI at \$23.99 or less.

**Q: What are the next steps?**

A: Additional station options will be shared with all stakeholders. This information will be shared with all the stakeholders and presented to the decision makers.

**Q: What would it cost to have the entire infrastructure in place for the additional stations?**

A: It would cost approximately \$1.5M in construction costs per station.

**Q: When do you expect a decision on this?**

A: Sometime in February 2008.

**Q: If you build additional stations later, who pays for it?**

A: We will have to be creative. The new Hiawatha station (18<sup>th</sup> Station) is being funded by federal, state and local funds. We would have to look for flexible funding streams.

**Minnesota Commercial Rail Road Bridge (MCRR).** Mr. Fuhrmann stated that the DEIS analysis identified that the MCRR Bridge's vertical clearance above University Avenue does not meet anticipated design standards for the LRT vehicles and the horizontal clearance between the bridge's piers located on each side of University does not provide for the anticipated LRT and Roadway section. Mr. Fuhrmann presented an overview of the four alternatives that were developed for the bridge vicinity.

- **Alternative A** – LRT located in the median of University with two east bound and two west bound lanes split around the intermediate piers of the existing bridge. No modifications are proposed.
- **Alternative B** – Two east bound and two west bound lanes reduced to one lane in each direction at the existing bridge. No modifications are proposed.

- **Alternative C** – Two east bound lanes also shifted to the South beneath a new, reconstructed south span of the bridge. The south sidewalk would be eliminated and the south abutment of the bridge would be rebuilt requiring construction outside the existing ROW.
- **Alternative D (DEIS Concept)** – east bound and west bound traffic lanes adjacent to the LRT alignment beneath a new, reconstructed bridge with a center pier. The sidewalks would remain behind the piers adjacent to the outside travel lanes.

## **5. Presentation and Discussion:**

**Rice, Capitol East and 10<sup>th</sup> Street Station Location.** Chuck Hymes, DMJM Harris, provided an overview of the Rice Street Station Options including the original DEIS station location and options for the station east of Rice Street. The recommended location is on the south side of University immediately east of Rice Street. Mr. Hymes also presented the recommended locations of the Capitol east station and the 10<sup>th</sup> Street location.

## **6. Wrap up and adjourn**

Ms. Frits adjourned the meeting at 5:30

Prepared by Rita Rodriguez, Community Outreach Coordinator