

Metropolitan Council

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

**Meeting of the Central Corridor Management Committee
January 14, 2009**

Members Present	Peter Bell, Chair	Khani Sahebjam (Scott McBride – alt.)	Kathleen O’Brien
	Toni Carter	Rafael Ortega	Peter McLaughlin
	Jim Westerhaus	Chris Coleman	Reynaldo Aligada
	R.T. Rybak (Peter Wagenius – alt.)	Tom Hanson (Keith Bogut – alt.)	
Members Absent	Paul Krause		

1. CALL TO ORDER

A quorum was present when Chair Peter Bell called the January 14, 2009 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 12/10/08 MINUTES

A motion was made by Westerhaus, seconded by Bogut to approve the minutes from the 12/10/08 meeting. The motion carried.

3. BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC) AND COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC) REPORTS

Karri Plowman reported from the BAC. There have been 6 listening sessions held in the community and one more requested from the Aurora/St. Anthony neighborhood. The BAC is finalizing its draft of comments that have been solicited from the business community; the report will be presented to the CCMC when complete. Sessions will continue into the 2009 calendar year. Plowmann responded to Coleman’s question that the BAC is beginning outreach efforts with businesses in the St. Paul Lowertown neighborhood near the proposed Maintenance Facility. Plowmann stated that the 2009 BAC goals include pilot programs such as: one stop resource directory, information/lunch bus-“Shop University Avenue” event, collaborative programs to attract people to businesses before, during and after construction.

Robin Cauffman reported from the CAC. She stated that the Station Art Committees will spend most of the next few months working with the artists and the communities and outreach staff. An orientation session was held for the Station Art Committee members was held on 1/13/09. The orientation included project overview, station design and the art process. There were small group discussions at this orientation. Visioning sessions will be held in the early part of February.

4. FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (FEIS) UPDATE

Mark Fuhrmann highlighted three schedule scenarios in his presentation (Met Council, FTA and MPR). FTA has requested that the CCPO not submit the FEIS until the documentation is bolstered in the noise and vibration sections. FTA will meet with staff in early February to identify and agree to the expectations of what additional information is required of the FTA.

FTA has directed the project to allow additional time in the schedule for review for the financial assessment and acceptance of the request to enter final design and also allow additional time in the schedule for review prior to the final approval to enter final design.

Prior to review of the MPR schedule dates, Peter Bell stated that an agreement has been reached with MPR on how the project can proceed, allowing adherence to the FTA schedule of dates column. Bell presented a letter dated January 14, 2009 from MPR. Fuhrmann emphasized the front and back end of the MPR schedule scenario,

based on the letter to Met Council from MPR last week. CCPO will develop a draft noise and vibration mitigation plan by mid-February, with welcome input from MPR consultants. MPR has voiced their continued concern for successful mitigation and their preference for consideration of an alternate route for the LRT. MPR reserves all rights if they feel that the Metro Council mitigation plan does not meet their needs. Carter stated that there is a need to establish agreed-upon “acceptable” levels for noise and vibration, and Fuhrmann further explained FTA guidelines and the existing and predicted noise and vibration conditions.

In answer to Bell’s question, Fuhrmann stated that there are no time contingencies built into the budget, and also stated that the project would not be “shovel ready” in time for FTA environmental clearance, if Economic Stimulus Funds were to become available. The FTA may have some flexibility to expedite some of the regulatory steps required.

O’Brien stated that the U of M has an interest in the structure of the construction schedule and making preparations for interruptions. Fuhrmann stated that the construction schedule is envisioned to be approximately eight or nine construction packages. The CCPO continues to work on the precise reach of the construction packages.

Fuhrmann reported on the vibration report and mitigation measures. O’Brien stated that the U of M continues to have questions about the results of the studies and O’Brien presented a list dated January 14, 2009 from the U of M of the types of research performed at the U of M facilities and the issues that need to be addressed in the vibration and electromagnetic interference studies.

O’Brien asked for an update on the funding pool to which the CCPO is applying and the CCLRT position compared to other projects around the country. This report can be an item for an upcoming CCMC meeting.

5. TRACTION POWER SUBSTATIONS/SIGNAL BUNGALOWS

Dan Soler reported on the Traction Power Stations and Signal Bungalows. He defined what the facilities are, the traction power substation placement distance, from the LRT tracks and from each other, that is needed to ensure continuous power; footprint of the site(s) needed for construction/maintenance, etc. The signal bungalows are more site-specific; where possible they are proposed to occupy the same site as the traction power stations. He briefed the committee on each proposed location along the alignment for these facilities and showed photographs of existing buildings along HLRT, as noted in the presentation copies. In answer to a question from Westerhaus, Soler stated that the traction power stations have not interfered with other electronic communications in places where they are in use.

O’Brien and McLaughlin noted that attention should be given to the best ultimate use for property and future development on or near the facility sites (post CCLRT construction and operation), and also attention be given to the possible expense to move/relocate the facility if needed in the future.

6. STREETSCAPE

In the interest of time, this item will be presented at the February CCMC meeting.

7. NEXT MEETING – FEBRUARY 11, 2009 1:00 PM

Motion by Wagenius, seconded by McLaughlin to adjourn the 1/14/09 CCMC meeting at 2:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, LuAnne Major, Recording Secretary