

Metropolitan Council

Metropolitan Council Chambers, 390 No. Robert St., St. Paul, Mn. 55101

Meeting of the Central Corridor Management Committee

April 9, 2008

Members Present	Peter Bell, Chair	Toni Carter	Kathleen O'Brien
	Tom Hanson	Rafael Ortega	Peter McLaughlin
	Reynaldo Aligada	Jim Westerhaus	Bob McFarlin
	Chris Coleman		R.T. Rybak
Members Absent	Paul Krause	Mary Hill Smith	

1. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum being present Chair Peter Bell called the April 9, 2008 regular meeting of the Central Corridor Management Committee to order at 1:10 pm at the Metropolitan Council offices at 390 North Robert St., St. Paul.

2. APPROVAL OF 04/09/08 AGENDA AND 02/27/07 MINUTES

Motion was made by Carter, seconded by O'Brien to adopt the agenda for the 04/09/08 meeting and the minutes of the 02/27/08 meeting. The motion carried.

Prior to the next regularly scheduled agenda item(s), Bell suggested some time be provided for CCMC members to share thoughts on the recent bonding bill developments.

Mayor Coleman presented a resolution that he drafted and would like the committee to adopt and forward to the Governor (motion is attached to these minutes). The motion resolves that the Central Corridor Management Committee calls on the Governor and Minnesota Legislature not to adjourn from the 2008 legislative session without an appropriation of at least \$70 million for the Central Corridor.

Motion made by Coleman, seconded by Rybak to adopt the motion as provided (attached).

Discussion:

Members discussed the amount of work, time and money that has been spent on the Central Corridor project and the importance of the project. McLaughlin supported the resolution and stated there is still time in the legislative session to address funding, the motivation of this committee is to see that the corridor gets built on a timely basis. Members suggested changes in some of the wording in the resolution in the form of a friendly amendment. Coleman did not accept the friendly amendment, and stood by the resolution as written.

Motion passed, as presented, with 8 yes votes. Bell, McFarlin and Hanson abstained from the vote.

Staff (Mark Fuhrmann) answered various questions from committee members as to the affect of a delay to the project, and its position in the "queue" with the FTA, and the monetary and time costs that would be attributed to a delay.

3. WASHINGTON AVENUE TRANSIT/PEDESTRIAN MALL

Mark Fuhrmann introduced the following people for their reports and also made his reports:

a. University Campus Area Street Connections (Traffic Study #4) - Dan Soler gave a report on this subject which covers traffic directly in the East Bank Campus area. A presentation was given showing the roadway network and key intersections.

O'Brien stated that the U of M is very appreciative of the extensiveness and thoroughness of these traffic studies. The U of M has performed four previous studies of the same nature. The U of M agrees with Traffic Study #4 road needs that have been determined. The Central Corridor analysis has been reviewed by the U of M Traffic Engineering Div. in the IT Civil Engineering Dept. There are operational impacts as well (parking ramp), and

they are being looked at to help the roadway network operate successfully.

b. Bus Service Scenarios with Ridership and CEI Impacts – John Levin, Metro Transit, discussed bus service scenarios: 1) Intermodal Stations; 2A) 10th Avenue; 2B) Pleasant Street and 3) Buses on Washington Avenue. These scenarios address express routes, local routes and Route 16, along with the inter-campus shuttle. Levin answered questions regarding the operation costs of bus impacts, reduction in bus volume on Washington Avenue, logistics of the bus stop at Coffman Union. In answer to Bell’s question whether an analysis of bus operational cost impacts has been done, the model does take into account annual bus and rail operating costs that are in the CEI. McLaughlin asked for the breakdown of the annual operation costs for the various bus scenarios. Fuhrmann provided the bus-only operation costs in the corridor:

Scenario 1 = \$36.8 M Scenario 2A = \$37.7 M Scenario 2B = \$37.8 M Scenario 3 = \$38.2 M

Scenarios 3 and B (selected February 27, 2008) have the same operating costs of \$38.2 M

Bell asked that these figures be netted against current costs to determine if there are increased incremental costs in the scenarios, for future discussion. McLaughlin also asked for the costs for the University bus operations, as well.

Fuhrmann explained the scenarios and their ridership, cost and CEI (page 14 of presentation handout).

Ortega asked for figures on the operating costs for buses in East Metro, West Metro and University.

c. Stakeholder-Identified Improvement Needs – Due to time constraints, Mark Fuhrmann quickly highlighted slides 16-18 of the presentation/handouts addressing stakeholder identified needs. Actions have been identified, and lead agency and key stakeholder/participation identified. There were no questions from committee members pertaining to this subject at this time.

Prior to adjournment, O’Brien stated that the U of M believes the Central Corridor is an essential component in improving the Regional Transportation System. All of the U of M’s actions are trying to get to the best alignment and one that works with the university as well as the entire line.

4. UNIVERSITY AVENUE DESIGN ELEMENTS – Mark Fuhrmann

Due to insufficient time at this meeting, this item will be discussed at a future CCMC meeting.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS TO NOTICE OF INTENT TO PUBLISH THE SUPPLEMENTAL DEIS – Kathryn O’Brien

Due to insufficient time at this meeting, this item will be discussed at a future CCMC meeting.

6. MUNICIPAL CONSENT CALENDAR – Mark Fuhrmann

Due to insufficient time at this meeting, this item will be discussed at a future CCMC meeting.

7. NORTHERN ALIGNMENT OVERVIEW – Mike Monahan, SRF

Due to insufficient time at this meeting, this item will be discussed at a future CCMC meeting.

8. INFORMATION SHARING BY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Due to insufficient time at this meeting, this item will be discussed at a future CCMC meeting.

9. NEXT MEETING – To be determined

Chair Bell noted the large amount of information yet to be shared with the committee members, and concern that ample time be allowed to present that information. He suggested that the Committee plan to meet (in approximately 2 weeks) prior to the regularly scheduled meeting on May 14, 2008. He suggested a 3-hour session in order to discuss in detail the remaining items that were to be brought before this meeting. Meeting date and time to be determined.

10. ADJOURN– Chair Bell adjourned the meeting at 2:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted, LuAnne Major, Recording Secretary

WHEREAS, the Central Corridor is one of the most significant economic development initiatives for Saint Paul, the metropolitan region and the State of Minnesota in recent history; and

WHEREAS, local and county governments, community, business, labor, and foundation leaders have formed a historic, diverse partnership to advance the Central Corridor as the spine of a strategic regional transit plan; and

WHEREAS, the federal government will be asked to commit \$455 million to Central Corridor at such time as a 50% local match is identified and that federal funding cannot be obtained without the state's commitment; and

WHEREAS, Governor Pawlenty included the Central Corridor in his bonding proposal for \$70 million while requesting local units of government to come together to cut costs; and

WHEREAS, local governments have worked together to address the requirements that Governor Pawlenty established; and

WHEREAS, the Minnesota House and Senate passed a bonding bill including Central Corridor funding of \$70 million; and

WHEREAS, Governor Pawlenty chose to line-item veto the funding for Central Corridor in the bonding bill;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Central Corridor Management Committee does hereby call on the Governor and the Minnesota Legislature not to adjourn from the 2008 legislative session without an appropriation of at least \$70 million for the Central Corridor.