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A 2040 plan with priorities for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines in development</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Near-Term F, G, H lines

Mid-Term

- Update Network
- Next BRT Plans

Longer-Term Implementation
Arterial BRT Corridor Development Process

1. **IDENTIFY**
   - Spring 2020
   - Based on the Network Next principles, identify about 20 potential corridors for arterial BRT implementation.

2. **SCREEN**
   - Summer 2020
   - Conduct screening to identify about 10 most promising arterial BRT candidate corridors to advance.

3. **EVALUATE**
   - Fall 2020
   - Develop detailed arterial BRT concepts and apply robust evaluation criteria including cost, ridership & other benefits to sort lines into three tiers.

4. **PRIORITIZE**
   - Winter 2020/2021
   - Review top performers based on readiness criteria to further prioritize the next three lines for implementation.

   - METRO F Line
   - METRO G Line
   - METRO H Line
Four principles guide Network Next planning

• Based in Council policy, shaped by performance data and community input
  - Advance Equity and Reduce Regional Racial Disparities
  - Build on Success to Grow Ridership
  - Design a Network that Supports a Transit-Oriented Lifestyle
  - Ensure the Long-Term Sustainable Growth of the Bus Network
# December 2020: Evaluation results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Como/ Maryland</th>
<th>Johnson/ Lyndale</th>
<th>West Broadway/ Cedar</th>
<th>Nicollet</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Randolph/ East 7th</th>
<th>Rice/ Robert</th>
<th>Grand</th>
<th>Lowry</th>
<th>63rd/ Zane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Score</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Is corridor affected by other planning efforts? | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness Outcome</th>
<th>Consider for Tier 1</th>
<th>Consider for Tier 1</th>
<th>Hold for Tier 2/3</th>
<th>Hold for Tier 2/3</th>
<th>Consider for Tier 1</th>
<th>Hold for Tier 2/3</th>
<th>Consider for Tier 1</th>
<th>Hold for Tier 2/3</th>
<th>Consider for Tier 1</th>
<th>Hold for Tier 2/3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 (3-4 corridors)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 (3-4 corridors)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3 (3-4 corridors)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NetworkNEXT
December 2020: Near-term candidate corridors

- Central (Route 10)
- Como/Maryland (Route 3)
- Johnson/Lyndale (Route 4)
- Rice/Robert (Routes 62 and 68)
Outreach feedback: Top priority corridor (all respondents)

- Over 4,100 completed surveys
  - 119 in person, 3,997 online
  - 31% BIPOC, 69% white
  - Responses distributed across the region with most respondents in areas served by core and suburban local service

- What we heard:
  - Provide service to BIPOC communities
  - Provide service to areas not currently served by BRT, LRT
  - Facilitate connections to home, work, school, stores and key destinations
Prioritization phase factors reviewed

- Public feedback on top-tier corridors
- Local government input and coordination
  - Resolutions/letters
  - Scan of planned street projects
- Based on key differentiators:
  1. Identify the F Line
  2. Identify the G and H lines
Key differentiators for identifying the F Line

• Ridership – existing and potential
  *How many people would benefit from each line?*

• Capital and operating costs
  *How much additional funding is needed to build and operate each line?*
### Ridership comparison across multiple indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing (2019)</th>
<th>Initial Potential Based on Past BRT Growth</th>
<th>2040 STOPS Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7,192</td>
<td>9,000 to 9,700</td>
<td>12,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como/Maryland</td>
<td>5,722</td>
<td>7,100 to 7,700</td>
<td>11,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson/Lyndale</td>
<td>5,236</td>
<td>6,500 to 7,100</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice/Robert</td>
<td>3,781</td>
<td>4,700 to 5,100</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital and operating cost comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Est. Capital Cost ($2024 M)</th>
<th>Est. Annual Operating Cost ($2025 M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>$81.3</td>
<td>$15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como/Maryland</td>
<td>$104.5</td>
<td>$21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson/Lyndale</td>
<td>$93.4</td>
<td>$25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice/Robert</td>
<td>$77.9</td>
<td>$26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Key differentiators for the F Line – Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Como/Maryland</th>
<th>Johnson/Lyndale</th>
<th>Rice/Robert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ridership</strong></td>
<td>7,200–12,100</td>
<td>5,700–11,600</td>
<td>5,200–13,200</td>
<td>3,800–9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Cost</strong></td>
<td>$81M</td>
<td>$105M</td>
<td>$93M</td>
<td>$78M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Operating Cost</strong></td>
<td>$15M</td>
<td>$21M</td>
<td>$26M</td>
<td>$26M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td>F Line</td>
<td>Consider for G/H Line</td>
<td>Consider for G/H Line</td>
<td>Consider for G/H Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key to colors: Good, Better, Best*
Identifying G and H lines

• Remaining corridors for consideration
  - Como/Maryland
  - Johnson/Lyndale
  - Rice/Robert

• Factor:
  - Expanding the reach of METRO in transit-supportive areas not served by BRT/LRT
Identifying G and H lines

- Remaining corridors for consideration
  - Como/Maryland
  - Johnson/Lyndale
  - Rice/Robert

- Factor:
  - Implementation order
## Factors for identifying G and H lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors for identifying G and H lines</th>
<th>Como/ Maryland</th>
<th>Johnson/ Lyndale</th>
<th>Rice/ Robert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding the reach of METRO</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation order with other corridors</td>
<td>Implement Rice/Robert first</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome

- **H Line**
  - **Mid-Term Implementation**
- **G Line**

---

**Key to colors**

- Good
- Best
Network Next
Near-term BRT corridors

- F Line (Central)
- G Line (Rice / Robert)
- H Line (Como / Maryland)

- Aligns with Network Next principles
- Serves Anoka, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey counties
- Provides significant expansion in access by 2030
Jobs accessible on transit in 60 minutes on planned METRO network

Jobs accessible on transit in 60 minutes with F, G, H lines added. Areas with increases are highlighted.
Future METRO vision with F, G, H lines
Next steps

• February: Communicate Network Next BRT results
  - Feb 24: Information item to Metropolitan Council, publish results

• March: Metropolitan Council action to adopt Network Next BRT results and name F, G, H lines
  - March 8 (Transportation Committee)
  - March 25 (Council)

• March / April: TAB process and action to award Regional Solicitation funds for F Line
  - April 21: Full TAB meeting

• Later in 2021:
  - Initiate Network Next planning and engagement around local / express bus improvements
  - Begin early planning for F Line