

Meeting of the Central Corridor Community Advisory Committee

May 21, 2009

Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Kirstin Sersland Beach, Margot Imdieke Cross, Ann Finseth, Denise Fosse, Richard Hanson, Karl Karlson, Jackie Lunde, Rozanne Severance, Jim Thalhuber, Keith Thompson, Chip Welling, Anne White, John Wicks.

Others Present: Joey Browner, Robin Caufman, Dana Happel, Linda Jungwirth, Christina Morrison, Shoua Lee, Darrell Paulsen, Rita Rodriguez, Joe Scala, Alicia Vap,

1) MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

Kirstin Beach called the meeting to order at 5:12M and asked if anyone had changes to the March meeting minutes. Chip Welling noted that he would email changes to comments he made at the April meeting. Anne White noted a correction on page 3 of the March meeting minutes related to the response to Veronica's question whether there would be a TPSS located at Rice Street. Ms. White also asked for follow up on issues raised at the March meeting including list of trades needed for construction.

2) REPORTS

Chairs Report

As part of the Chair's report, Ms. Beach mentioned a recent meeting of the Transportation Advisory Board where people testified about accessibility of the transit system. Ms. Beach reflected on the Central Corridor design and how it already incorporates features to make it accessible such as upgraded sidewalks with tactile strips.

Rozanne Severance stated that her groups' purpose is to advocate for access for all people, including families with strollers.

Anne White noted that this is good because people at the Community Summit expressed concerns about safety and ease of access for elderly people, families with strollers, and not just people of disability.

CAC Member Report

Ms. Beach asked for any reports from the CAC members. There were none.

Outreach Report

Rita Rodriguez reported on the seven public art open houses that have been held over the past 2 weeks. She said that they were well attended and that the participants talked directly to artists and provided constructive feedback. Ms. Rodriguez also provided an update on the outreach activities related to the parking report. We have now made presentations all the District Council's along University Avenue in St. Paul and the University Avenue Business Association. She mentioned the upcoming public meeting on May 28 at Goodwill; residents and businesses are welcome to attend. Robin Caufman also mentioned that we held the first parking workshop this week. It was well attended; we will provide more detail about these workshops at a future CAC meeting.

Anne suggested inviting the residents to the pin up section of the workshops. Margot Imdieke asked if handicapped accessibility is part of the discussion in the parking report. Ms. Caufman noted that the

issue is identified as a consideration in the parking report and indicated we are responding to a request to talk about the issues with the TAAC at their June meeting.

Anne Finseth asked if handicapped accessibility was brought up at the workshop meeting. It was discussed.

Anne asked for a report on the workforce mixer. She noted that it was well attended by union representatives, training organizations. The DCC originally objected to holding it during the day because they feared it would have low attendance. She suggested that other opportunities be provided at local trade schools, etc... Robin Cauffman reported that we had over 300 people.

Dana provided a report of the downtown St. Paul outreach activities including 4th Street advanced utility relocation, including a meeting that was held with business and property owners. She also informed the CAC that a task force has been created to provide public input into exterior improvements to the Operation and Maintenance Facility.

Karl asked if we will be holding any more public meetings about the advanced utility relocation. At the end of June we will be holding a public meeting.

Mark Fuhrmann provided a project update as requested by CAC member. The FTA issued their updated New Starts report, which includes the status of projects in the pipeline. The Central Corridor LRT project has been upgraded from a "Medium" to "Medium-High" based on several considerations including financial commitments and transit supportive land use plans of the cities.

The second update is that the State Legislature provided \$8.5 million in bonding in this session, which completes the States 10% and 50% of the local funding.

The third update is the status of the environmental process. The FTA is reviewing the draft Final Environmental Impact Statement. We are working with the FTA to finalize the document with supplemental information and are aiming to have it published in early June. Following a 30 day public review period, the FTA will issue a Record of Decision.

Denise Fosse asked for clarification on the local funding partners. They are State of Minnesota (10%), Ramsey County (7%), Hennepin Co. (3%) and the County Transit Improvements Board (30%). Chair Beach noted that the creation of the CTIB and quarter sales tax helps

Chip asked what happens after the Record of Decision. The project still needs the request Final Design and the Full Funding Grant Agreement for the \$457 million federal grant.

Anne White asked about the time frame between the publication until issues of ROD. The process takes 30-60 days; the first 30 days provide for public review and comment.

Mark also mentioned that he is seeking a Letter of No Prejudice from the FTA to proceed with advanced construction on 4th Street to conduct work prior to receiving final approval and the FFGA. The work will start early August through November.

Chair Beach asked what it would take to get a "High".

Jackie Lunde asked what we get by moving from a "Medium" to "Medium High" ranking. The confidence of the FTA.

3) STATION DESIGN

Alicia Vap presented an update on the station design by reviewing slides 7-13 in the power point presentation. Ms. Vap reiterated that the general station design will be consistent for each of the stations. She noted that the Central Corridor Project Office has completed an updated cost estimate as well as refined the materials and color palette for the stations. As she reviewed the station design graphic, she displayed material samples including copper that will be used for the canopy. She also showed a sample of tempered glass with a subtle pattern to discourage etch artists. Architectural cast concrete will be used on the communication cabinets. Colored steel could be used for pillars and station structure. She noted that the materials are up for discussion with the community and coordination with the public artists. Richard Hanson asked what the dark objects on the station platform are. There are 4 cabinets per station that house communication equipment.

Jackie Lunde asked what the blue and yellow boxes are above the railing. They are placeholders for signs

Rozanne Severance asked about the width of the pillars and the materials used? The light columns are steel wrapped in concrete.

Anne White noted that Seitu's concepts changed the light structure? How much flexibility is there in the individual station design to change? Some flexibility as long as it meets lighting requirements.

Anne White suggested having maps at each of the stations that tells people about the surrounding neighborhood and services, stores, parks etc... That is not in the current plans.

John Wicks asked if the transparent roof will be able to support snow and thought it would be hard to keep clean. He also noted that the tactile strip on Hiawatha LRT is crumbling and hoped that Central Corridor LRT design would be different. The canopy will not be made of glass; we are researching other translucent materials. Metro Transit is aware of the issue with the tactile strips.

Jackie Lunde noted that the canopies would be a good opportunity for solar. We are meeting with Xcel but it is not currently in the project budget.

Denise asked if the stations would have heat lamps. There will be heating elements in the shelter, close to where people are?

Rozanne Severance noted concerns she had with the Hiawatha LRT station including size, seating arrangements and art obstructions. We are not allowing art within the shelter or jutting out from pillars.

4) PUBLIC ART

Alicia Vap continued the presentation by reviewing each of the station concepts using the boards from the public art open houses.

Karl Karlson asked if the concepts will be posted online because some people were not able to attend the public meetings. They will be posted the on centralcorridor.org website along with comment cards. Robin Cauffman will email the link to the CAC on Friday morning.

Jackie Lunde asked how much budget is available for each station. \$187,000.

CAC members had the following comments or questions about specific stations:

Rozanne Severance raised concern about the size of the flowers on the East Bank Station and the potential obscene nature of some of the flowers. She also raised safety concerns over the conceptual leaves on the Fairview Station railing and asked that they not be pointy.

Jackie Lunde asked general question about whether the backside of the stations could be used as a display case for local artists. She also raised concern about having stations look too much alike, especially with the wheel theme. We've heard this suggestion and have asked Metro Transit operations and maintenance staff for feedback.

Several CAC members raised concern about graffiti on the stations. Ms. Cauffman noted that the stations do include security cameras and maintenance staff is very quick to remove graffiti.

John Wicks asked what the material was being used to the 10th Street Station waterfall concept and how is it being installed? It is a glass mosaic, we'll have to ask the artist how it is created and installed.

Anne White said that she attended several of the public open houses. She said that she is disappointed because of how limited the artists are able to do within the \$187,000 budget, given that the stations are 300' long. However she did acknowledge it is reality and the constraints we are working with.

Richard Hanson said he had been skeptical about what the stations would like given the restricted budget, but that is impressed with the variety and the quality of the artists. Chair Beach agreed that we had achieved a balance.

Rozanne Severance noted that people have expectations about the public art but we need to consider maintenance and durability. She said that the concepts do reflect lessons learned on Hiawatha LRT and appreciates that.

5) ADJOURNMENT

Chair Beach asked if anyone from the public wanted to comment on the project.

6) ADJOURNMENT

After inviting anyone from the public to address the CAC on other topics and seeing no one, Ms. Beach adjourned the meeting at **7:00pm**

Next meeting: June 18, 2009, 5:00-7:00pm.

Attachment 1: CAC Meeting Feedback

1. What do you like most about the proposed materials for the stations? Why?

- The Variety
- Public Art – Flowers and birds at East Bank & West Bank Stations are not that representative of the area. I'm concerned that the artists at some stations aren't trying to incorporate the flavor of the community as much as trying to impress their own style.
- Very Robust, easy to fix if broken or damaged.
- The materials are modern and seem to be able to be well maintained while offering personal touch type variations.
- I like the simple modern design and honest use of basic construction materials. Also the rectangular design of wall elements has appropriate scale. I think by using alternate color schemes and materials you would give them uniqueness. I think some of the artist concepts will ruin the simple architecture of the stations.
- I like the art in the platform floors as long as it will take the cold weather. I like some of the materials for the stations.
- Need as much vibrant color as possible.

2. What do you like least about the proposed materials for the stations? Why?

- Questions on durability
- Colors on Steel, orange, purple, green and earth tones.
- Very little community involvement. 5 Artists, why not have had regional voting and 5 live-in residents design the art?
- I don't think there is anything I don't like about the materials. I'm more concerned about how materials will wear over time and having good colors that will not be really nice in our area and loud and tacky in another area. I have not heard too much on green design?
- The roof, copper and glass. I suggest deleting the glass and possible are stainless steel or heavy gauge aluminum. The glass will be covered in winter with snow. The seal on horizontal glass panel will eventually leak. Glass in flat roof then causes additional maintenance and agencies have limited money for maintenance.
- I don't like the size of the wrapped columns. I hope they aren't as big as they look in the pictures. (Rice Street and others.
- Need to really focus on the back side of the station to make the view from the sidewalk as attractive as possible.

3. What do outstanding questions or concerns do you have about the station design?

- None really. Excited on progress.
- Make sure artists work does not have sharp edges or jut out. People will lean against it. Do the train cars have designated handicap seating?
- I am most concerned about on-going maintenance and cleanliness. I believe that stations that are all sure to get run down and dirty have a propensity to become crime ridden. I am concerned that all stations will be adequately patrolled and well kept. Maps of the neighborhood are a good idea. Revenue – sell space on the neighborhood maps for stores and business owners to have their names on the maps.
- It is unclear to me if the art work is applied to exterior walls of small enclosures or is the artist actually constructing the wall. I'm not impressed by some of the artistic schemes at some stations and I think the whole topic should be reconsidered. I think \$187, 000.00 per station is too much money.
- Have a presentation from the state historical preservation people to hear what is being done for all the historical properties along or near the route.

Attachment 2: CAC Meeting Feedback

Results tallied from feedback forms distributed toward end of meeting. Form asked members to grade overall meeting performance and today's meeting format on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 was the lowest and 5 the highest. Grades are replicated in columns to the right.	Today's Meeting Format	Today's Meeting Content	Overall meeting performance
	5	5	5
	3	3	3
	5	5	5
	5	5	5
	4.5	4.5	4.5
Average	4.5	4.5	4.5

How can we improve?

- Website & map. MapQuest sent me to Fairview Ave N; I missed half of the meeting.
- Doing Well.
- For the art presentation, she stood blocking the view from the right side of the room.

Attachment 3: Email to CAC members with answers to questions

From: Caufman, Robin

Sent: Friday, May 22, 2009 2:44 PM

To: Caufman, Robin

Cc: Lee, Shoua; Happel, Dana; Rodriguez, Rita; Browner, Joey; Hill, Jessica; Pham, Hue; Walding, Shawn

Subject: Central Corridor CAC responses to technical questions at last night's meeting

CAC members – Alicia asked me to forward on answers to questions that were raised at last night's CAC meeting:

-What is the width of the light columns? The light column is a 6 inch steel tube. We have given the artist a 2 ft zone around the light column for artwork opportunities—this was shown on the station illustrations as concrete.

-Can the light column have a different shape? Who is the manufacturer? The light support/armature can change shape. We do not yet have a specific manufacturer—it's shown as a steel tube welded together.

-How soon does our maintenance crew respond to graffiti? Very quickly—goal is to deter graffiti by removing it

-How does the glass mosaic get assembled? On site, off site? The mosaic is assembled off site and shipped here for installation.

Alicia Vap, AICP

Central Corridor Project Office

W: 651-602-1961

C: 612-741-0195