

2.3.5 Operating Plan Assumptions

The Central Corridor Operating Plan for LRT is consistent with the application and approval to enter PE and is included in the 2006 Central Corridor LRT New Starts Report. The Central Corridor LRT Project is also included in the Metropolitan Council 2030 Transportation Policy Plan. Underlying network assumptions and modifications developed since publication of the AA/DEIS are included in the Baseline Alternative described in the preceding section.

The operating plan assumes the same span of service hours as currently operated on the Hiawatha LRT. This operating plan assumes 7.5-minute service frequencies during peak periods and 10-minute service frequencies during off-peak hours and on weekends. Rail operating requirements (such as car-miles, train hours) are consistent with approval to enter PE and included in the 2006 Central Corridor LRT New Starts Application.

The Central Corridor LRT Study Area includes numerous fixed route and express route services. Many of these services will continue to operate the same as the existing service. Of the supporting bus network, alignment and headway changes are proposed on two local and three express routes. Table 2-3 identifies service plan headways for these routes as well as the LRT service. The Build Alternative requires five fewer buses than the existing service as a result of reductions in Route 16 service headways (over existing and No-Build Alternative) and the elimination of Route 50 (Baseline Service).

Table 2-3 AA/DEIS Alternative Service Plan Headways (Peak/Off-Peak Headways)

	No-Build	Baseline	Build Alternative
Route 16	10/10	20/30	20/30
Route 50	30/60	6/10	NA
Route 94B	30/-	30/-	30/-
Route 94C	30/-	30/-	30/-
Route 94D	20/30	20/30	20/30
LRT Service	N/A	N/A	7.5/10

2.3.6 Comparative Evaluation of AA/DEIS LPA and Proposed Changes

Table 2-4 provides a summary of the anticipated effects and a comparison between the AA/DEIS LPA and proposed changes to the AA/DEIS LPA as disclosed in the SDEIS. Results are summarized for the No-Build Alternative, the AA/DEIS LPA, and proposed changes to the LPA. These effects are discussed in more detail in Chapters 3 through 9.

**Table 2-4 Comparative Evaluation of the AA/DEIS LPA
and Proposed Changes to AA/DEIS LPA**

		No-Build Alternative	AA/DEIS LPA	Proposed Changes to AA/DEIS LPA
Transit	Forecast Year Total LRT Ridership	N/A	38,100	41,790
	Peak Period Headways (minutes)	N/A	7.5	7.5
	Non-Peak Period Headways (minutes)	N/A	10	10
Costs	Capital Costs (2007 dollars)	N/A	\$990 Million (escalated to 2007 dollars)	\$909.1 Million
	Capital Funding Sources	N/A	50% Federal; 50% State/Local	50% Federal; 50% State/Local
	Annual O&M Costs (2007 dollars)	N/A	\$60.7 Million	\$53.9 Million
Social Effects	Land Use			
	Compatible with Existing Land Use	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Consistent with Comprehensive Plans	No	Yes	Yes
	Compatible with Planned Development	No	Yes	Yes
	Consistent with Local Zoning	No	Yes	Yes
	Neighborhood Effects			
	Community Facility Impacts	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
	Community Cohesion	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
	Acquisitions and Displacements			
	Number of Acquisitions	None	114 partial, 11 total and 12 non-residential buildings	100 parcels Total; 68 parcels and 31.48 acres, 2 non-residential buildings are related Key Project Elements
	Cultural Resources			
	Potential Adverse Effects-Archeological	None	Undetermined; Phase II recommended	None anticipated
	Potential Adverse Effects-Historic Properties	None	Undetermined; Phase II required	TBD- ongoing coordination
	Section 4(f) Impact	No impact	None anticipated	TBD- ongoing coordination

		No-Build Alternative	AA/DEIS LPA	Proposed Changes to AA/DEIS LPA
	Parklands and Recreational Areas			
	Section 4(f) Impact	None	None anticipated	1 Temporary construction impact; 1 ROW acquisition; other potential impacts to be determined
	Visual Effects			
	Potential Impacts	No impact	Temporary construction impacts; introduction of overhead contact system (OCS) and new station facilities	Visual changes due to construction of vehicle maintenance and storage facility in downtown St. Paul and At-Grade Transit/Pedestrian Mall at the U of M
	Environmental Justice			
Disproportionate Impacts	Minority, low-income and transit dependent populations would not be served	None anticipated	None anticipated	
Environmental Effects	Geologic Resources			
	Groundwater	No impact	Potential construction impacts	Same as AA/DEIS LPA
	Water Resources			
	Wetlands (Acres)	No impact	No impact	No impact
	Floodplains (# of 100-year crossings)	No impact	No impact; permit required	No impact; permit required
	Effects to Habitat and Biota			
	Impacts	N/A	Minor impact	Minor impact
	Threatened and Endangered Species			
	Impacts	N/A	No impact	No impact
	Air Quality			
	Contribution to Regional Goals	Higher emissions due to increased traffic congestion	Reduced emission of CO and VOC, slightly higher NOx emissions	Similar to AA/DEIS LPA; detailed analysis to be completed during FEIS
	Noise and Vibration			
	Noise Receptors Above FTA Criteria	N/A	11 Category 2, 1 Category 3	11 Category 2, 1 Category 3

		No-Build Alternative	AA/DEIS LPA	Proposed Changes to AA/DEIS LPA
	Vibration Receptors Above FTA Criteria	No impact	None anticipated	Coordination with owners of vibration sensitive receptors is on-going; impact and mitigation to be detailed in the FEIS
	Hazardous/Regulated Materials			
	Impacts	No impact	Potential impact to 10 sites (High/Medium rating); additional evaluation recommended	42 sites listed for additional evaluation; impact and mitigation to be detailed in the FEIS
	Electromagnetic Fields and Utilities			
	Electromagnetic Fields	Not evaluated	Not evaluated	Coordination with owners of EMF sensitive receptors is on-going; detailed analysis to be included in the FEIS
	Utility Impacts	No impact	Relocation of utilities required for construction, impacts to be refined during final design	Minimization of impacts by implementing the diagonal 4 th and Cedar Streets Station and eliminating tunnel section at U of M
Economic Effects	Economic Effects	NA	Expansion in payroll and employment is anticipated with construction spending and recurring O&M costs	Same as AA/DEIS; analysis of revised LPA will be documented in the FEIS
	Development Effects	Existing development trends should continue	Increases in commercial and residential development densities is expected	Same as AA/DEIS
Transportation Effects	Consistent with Transportation Plans	No	Yes	Yes
	Number of Intersections at LOS E and F before mitigation (PM Peak 2030)	7	17	14

		No-Build Alternative	AA/DEIS LPA	Proposed Changes to AA/DEIS LPA
	Bike/Pedestrian Facility Effects	No	Short-term construction activity effects	Same as AA/DEIS with the exception of relocation of existing bike path at the Hiawatha LRT connection, and conversion of Washington Avenue into a transit/pedestrian mall at the U of M
Indirect and Cumulative Effects	Potential for Indirect Effects			
	Population Increase at Stations	N/A	Yes	Yes
	Employment Increase at Stations	N/A	Yes	Yes
	Environmental Resource Effects	N/A	None anticipated	None anticipated
	Potential for Cumulative Effects			
	Change in Development Character	N/A	Underutilized land and buildings will become prime development and redevelopment sites.	Same as AA/DEIS LPA.
	Linkage Between Transportation and Secondary Development	N/A	The expected changes in intensity and density of land uses around the proposed stations will be among the long-term indirect effects to the corridor.	Same as AA/DEIS LPA.