



Southwest Light Rail Transitway (LRT) Community Advisory Committee Meeting
May 10, 2012, 6:00 PM
Park Place West, 6465 Wayzata Boulevard,
St. Louis Park, Minnesota
Meeting Minutes - Revised

CAC Members: Ann Beuch, Anthony Pini, Art Higinbotham, B Aaron Parker, Bill Neuendorf, Bob Tift, Claudia Johnston-Madison (Alt) , Joan Peters, David Greene, Donald Eyberg, Elizabeth Ryan, Jami Lapray, Jeanette Colby, Jeff Ylinen, Jennifer Munt, John Erickson, Julie Williams (Alt) Kandi Arries, Kathy Cobb (Alt), Kathryn Kottke, Kelly Nelson, Kim kang, Linnea Sodergren, Maria Klein, Matt Flory, Maureen Hackett, Muhamed Aden, Neil Trembley, Patrick Bernal, Rolf Peterson, Steve Cramer, Sue Brown, Tom Jenny, Vicki Moore, Joan Peters, David Greene, Barry Schade, Patrick Bernal, Bill James

Staff and other attendees: Katie Walker, Mark Fuhrmann, Robin Caufman, Adele Hall, Nani Jacobsen, Jim Alexander, Rep. Hornstein, Denise Engen, Katie Walker, Bryan (Alt), Kevin Locke.

1. Welcome

Co-Chair Munt welcomed everyone to the meeting at 6:05 pm.

2. Approval of Minutes

Co-Chair Jennifer Munt asked if there were any comments on the minutes. Minutes passed.

3. SWLRT Project Overview

Mark Fuhrmann provided a report on funding. He noted a setback that the project wasn't in the bonding bill and handed out the statements made by the Chambers and Chair Haigh.

Steve Cramer-Asked what is next? Mark gave history on other projects. FTA watching the news but looking for local commitments over next two years.

Next, Mark Fuhrmann reviewed the presentation. Regional system and federal funding received for recent projects. He answered questions as they came up.

Mr. Aaron Parker asked if this was UPTA funding 1964 New Starts that grew into New Starts? Are legislators aware of how much we've paid in versus received? He suggested using in next year lobbying effects.

Mr. Fuhrmann reviewed the New Starts process slides. Noted entry into Preliminary Engineering in September 2011. We are currently at 1% design/engineering. Preliminary Engineering will take us to 30%

A CAC member noted the schedule shows FFGA in 3 years, does that mean there won't be any construction? Project can't acquire property or start construction until achieved Final Design.

Mr. Higinbotham asked for an update on the engineering consultant contract. We continue with contract in negotiations. Hope for approval within 1 month.

Mr. Higinbotham asked Mark Fuhrmann if the proposal submitted to the FTA included all the infrastructural items shown in the video "A Virtual Ride from Eden Prairie to Target Field" in the \$208 million in capital costs shown on Line 10 of the proposal; Mark Fuhrmann answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Erickson asked does that mean 70% Engineering is completed in Final Design? Advanced Preliminary Engineering is between 30% to 70% while waiting for FTA to review and approve Final Design application, this can take 1 year.

Does interactions with stakeholders change during phases? FTA expects interaction throughout. The earlier the better.

Jami LaPray asked if freight rail will be the first decision? Not in rank order. Needs to be resolved before Final Design. Ms. Arries asked who makes final decision? Addressed in DEIS where public input will inform the decisions.

David Green how far out for stations decision? Mr. Fuhrmann described municipal consent process that requires city council resolution on Preliminary Engineering plans.

Jeannette Colby asked if the cities know about this process? Yes we have spoken to them.

Mr. Higinbotham asked if by the time of municipal consent process will the freight rail relocation decision will be made? Not final mitigation, but element of design will be better known FEIS will respond to comments on DEIS.

Co-Chair Munt noted the experience of Hiawatha LRT and nothing worse than commenting too soon or too late. Next month we will discuss what topics the CAC is most interested in.

Maria Klein noted that the St. Louis Park school district commented on the DEIS, will those be included? Mr. Fuhrmann indicated that the Met Council would want to see comments. Apologizes for asking them to repeat comments but now that Met Council is lead, will want to hear again.

Mr. Fuhrmann reviewed FTA rating process and criteria. Noted that these are current but do change; Met Council and Hennepin County have commented on rule changing in the past.

Mr. Parker asked if Mark could review the criteria. Mr. Fuhrmann quickly reviewed the topics. He reviewed one of the criteria, the Cost Effectiveness Index (CEI), used to compare projects. 1.25 billion (Usefully up) compared to baseline of buses and car, SWLRT ratings and how we rank with other projects around the county and schedule and funding sources, the environmental process starting with the counties AA and DEIS including August publication and September Public hearing.

Bob Tift asked how many public hearing were held on Central Corridor for the FEIS? Three

Claudia Johnston-Madison asked a question about CEI ; \$1.25 billion budget and statement that not a lot of head room for cost increases. Mark clarified that not a lot of room and still be competitive. No line items specifically identified as mitigation. That will be refined in Preliminary Engineering and Final Design.

Vicki Moore asked if there are any examples where private dollars are used to mitigate? Feds love it. Example with Northstar, Twins fund \$2 million for vertical circulation. Ms. Moore also asked if the CAC can undertake fund raising to cover project examples? Mark noted need to leave it to the experts because requires agreements and contracts.

John Erickson asked if there will be other opportunities outside of the public hearings? Yes, open houses and public meetings.

After Mr. Fuhrmann completed the project overview, Co-Chair Munt introduced the video and noted that it is available at SWLRT.org website. Watched video.

Mr. Higinbotham noted number of bridges, mostly in Minnetonka and Eden Prairie and that there is \$208 million budgeted for bridges; wanted CAC to be aware. Encourage Preliminary Engineering to look at these costs as a top priority.

4. Southwest LRT Community Works Overview

Co-Chair Munt introduced Katie Walker to present an overview of the Southwest LRT Community Work program.

Ms. Walker reviewed her presentation. Noted job growth opportunities as well as community opportunities, ridership, connections, amenities, etc; She provided a history of Community Works program that started, in 1990's. Southwest LRT Community Works has a steering committee that has developed a vision and mission statement. Community Works received \$800, 000 for Southwest LRT. Purpose is to integrate light rail with housing economic development, etc. Land use will integrate with design and engineering as well as shared committees doing cross jurisdiction training and workshops. Reviewed the stationing design charette process flow chart and how LRT design and land use planning work together.

Jami Lapray asked if freight rail alignment chosen, how will Southwest LRT Community Works help mitigate issues? Ms. Walker noted that haven't talked about this with steering committee yet. May want to adjust boundaries to improve connections in this area.

Ms. Moore noted the Van White development plans that call for 2,300 housing units, Neil Trembley added that there has been lots of efforts focused on station areas. He encourages Southwest LRT Community Works to look at areas between stations that often overlooked. Ms. Walker acknowledged and will look into.

David Greene suggested everyone become familiar with Van White station area and plans to make improvements to the neighborhood. There is concern about station area plan that shows commuter rail operation facilities. Mark noted that it is not an LRT OMF.

Claudia Johnston-Madison asked a question about requesting data. Robin Cauffman responded that she is looking into the data request; need to follow the process for larger data requests. Ms. Cauffman suggested Ms. Johnston-Madison talk after meeting.

Mr. Parker noted he is excited with Southwest LRT Community Works running parallel with LRT engineering. Thanked for being part of the process.

CAC members asked if the alignment is set? No, not set in stone but 80% - 90%. Won't move much.

5. Open Forum

After the presentation was complete, the Co-Chair Colby asked if there were any comments from the audience.

6. Adjourn

Hearing no comments from the public, Co-Chair Colby adjourned the meeting at 7:55 PM.