



Southwest Light Rail (SWLRT) Business Advisory Committee Meeting  
January 9, 2013  
8:00 AM – 9:30 AM  
Southwest Project Office  
6465 Wayzata Blvd, St Louis Park, MN 55426

**BAC Members and Alternates:** Chair Will Roach, Brad Bakken, Curt Rahman, Daniel K. Duffy, Dave Pelner, Duane Peterson, Marc Bogursky, Mark Gustafson, Michelle Swanson, Rick Weiblen, Stephanie Peterson and Steve Faber.

**Staff and other attendees:** Mark Fuhrmann, Craig Lamothe, Robin Kaufman, Laura Baenen, Nani Jacobson, Jim Alexander, Kathryn Hansen, Sam O'Connell, Dan Pfeiffer, Mary Richardson, Jeff Peltola, Katie Walker, Kerri Pierce-Ruch, Beth Jameston and Greg Hunt.

**Welcome, Introductions and Approval of the December 12, 2012 Meeting Minutes**

Chair Will Roach called the meeting to order at 8:05 AM. Chair Roach welcomed BAC members and guests and called for the approval of the December minutes, motion was made to approve minutes. Chair Roach asked group to focus on how to measure success using project scenarios that could be discussed at the end of meeting.

**1. 2013 Project Look Ahead – Mark Fuhrmann**

Mark Fuhrmann provided an overview for 2013 through a presentation. The presentation covered project development overview, 2013 key issues and decisions and a project-wide look ahead. The SPO will create issue resolution teams with city and agency staff to tackle and resolve these issues, will report longer list of issues to group at later date.

Chair Will Roach announced that next BAC meeting will be combined with Community Advisory Committee so issues can be looked at and discussed together as a group.

**2. Preliminary Engineering (PE) Consultants Contract Awards/PE Next Steps – Jim Alexander**

Jim Alexander shared PE consultant contract awards through a presentation. The presentation covered PEC scope work 30% engineering, PEC procurement process: evaluation panels & technical advisory groups, December 19, 2012 Council PEC actions, PE activities, engineering & design look ahead

Q: Do the consultants come up with their estimate of what they think their fees will be or have you kind of given them this goal and is that why their numbers are so close? What is the DBE goal?

A: SPO does an independent cost estimate before proposals are received so we have a number in mind of what both contracts are going to cost. The work on the west and east actually comes out to be about the same even though the alignment might be a little more weighted toward the east portion. On the east we have freight rail which is a big issue, on the west there are some structures that we need to pay attention to more so than on the east there is also traveling demand modeling work that will be part of the full alignment that the west contract will be taking care. The SPO independent cost estimates were higher, so we actually landed under our independent cost estimates.

As far as the DBE Disadvantage Business Enterprise, that is a number percentage that is set by Met Council Office of Diversity before advertisement of the RFP. DBE identified 17% contract, it's the consultants obligation to attempt to meet that goal, if they can't they go through a process to analyze that, but it is generally perceived that they meet this

goal. The goal is set by the Council and each procurement is federally procured which has federal dollars to it so a percentage goal is identified.

Q: When you speak about location of LRT track preferred alternatives, are you just talking about minor changes to where station sites may be or smaller details?

A: Yes, it is really solidifying where the track is going to be located. SPO needs to validate that we can actually have the train track where it goes, horizontal and vertical curves. Right now the LPA shows a lot of this and we maybe need to smooth this out a little bit, we may look at our balanced speed for example, we have some assumptions with the LPA that we may validate to see if that is really something we want to do if we want to go a little faster or slower in other areas so it is fine keyed. Eden Prairie has acknowledged in their public comments that they are interested in maybe taking a look at the alignment in the Eden Prairie area. We are hoping to fine tune where the track is going to end up.

Q: Part of the 30% study also accounts for parking at the stations?

A: Yes, we will be addressing park and rides as well. We will be going through a marketing analysis for the whole alignment with the SWLRT consultants work. We already have an ideal of where park and rides may want to go and what sides they may want to be on, based on DEIS comments. Part of our work during PE will be identifying where those can be located and the foot-print of what the number of stalls are going to be, whether its surface or structure.

Q: Stations: are they set in stone? When will they be determined?

A: We are going to start with the LPA that we have the 17 stations then evaluating all the issues as we go through.

Q: Is there a process that you meet with city or constituents what discussions do you have concerning stations?

A: There are a couple things, first the issue resolution process meeting with cities talking about issues that come up from DEIS comments and lingering issues what need to be put in the plans from talking with engineers and bring to CAC and BAC for input. Second we are working parallel with HKGI, identifying developmental opportunities and infrastructure needs that will enhance and entice development around the stations. As design is developed we will inform each other as we get things evolved so at the end of the day when we have PE plans done we will have that planning input to facilitate as much as possible developmental opportunities around the project.

Q: Pertaining to the procurement contracts 30% engineering, does that mean after 30% you will be sending another RFP or renegotiating their contracts? What happens after?

A: Bringing plans and specs up to the 30% level, after we get to that point will say thank you to the consultants and hopefully they did a great job and then we will send them on their way. We then go out for new procurement for design. We are anticipating having only one contract for the full alignment but that is going to be formulated as we get through PE but will not be an extension of those contracts. Those contracts are only for the 30% effort and we will have some other procurement after that to follow on.

Q: Is that easy to do after these guys have spent all that time and effort getting to where they got to and then you throw some other group into the mix?

A: The intent is that we move through the procurement process early in the summer of 2012 where we wanted to get more opportunities out there so that is what we did with the two PE contracts and we intend to continue with another contract. There are a lot of entities out there interested in this project and we don't foresee an issue with drumming up that interest as we move forward to the last contract.

Q: Are they restricted from bidding on the second contract?

A: No.

Q: So they can bid if they want to stay in the process?

A: Yes.

Q: You have the risk of the new consultant coming in and saying they need to reevaluate the previous consultant so their fees are going to be so much higher because they were not in the first part of the phase?

A: We wouldn't be taking another hit because we have professionals working on plans that will be designed to a criteria that we have established from the project so it will be a little difficult for someone to come in and say they need to do something a little different to a station or track, etc. On these projects there aren't a lot of changes that you do to LRT designs; it is very uniform throughout the industry. We do have a lot of challenges but this is the process that we have to go through and feel that we can do it successfully.

Q: Is the process that you are going through here with SWLRT a consistent process and what is the best approach going forward and how does this process fit with the SWLRT project and past projects?

A: Hiawatha was a design build project had design completed to a certain point to get that out to prospective bidders to complete the project, somewhat similar to SWLRT. On Central Corridor from the start we had one contract that handled the LPA and finishing design 100%. This is done differently throughout the industry developed to certain areas such as this where they do 30% design, and then do follow on design; it is not unusual to do this type project development.

Completing 30%, staff will look at the next phase of project delivery, so that may look like another procurement for a designer to do final design under a design bid build project delivery method and following that final design we then go out for construction bids. The other project delivery option that we are going to have to look at is shifting to a design build where we would implement more of a full package of a joint venture type of approach with a designer/constructor that we will look at for the final design and actual construction. We don't know the answer to that and as we go through that project delivery option evaluation we will bring that back and talk with the committees.

Q: Is that the same process that was used for Central Corridor?

A: Central Corridor we implemented a design bid build delivery method so we had a single designer in this case for Central doing PE final design and then we bid out separately the construction contracts.

Q: So you had one designer from the start?

A: We did.

Q: On Hiawatha the group that did the 30% design drawings were they ultimately the group that did the final 70% design?

A: No, they were not.

Q: Did that work well in final transition?

A: There were some bumps in that transition from 30% to final design.

Q: That might be a good topic to devote a meeting towards, where we would have the ability to have inputs and guide that directionally both the balance of design process as well as the contracting component you may want to consider that as an item that we would want to discuss in the next 6 months.

A: That is probably at the end of this calendar or a year from now when we will need some input and advice to do a final design consultant contract or shift and do a design build delivery so in a year or so we will finalize that direction and bring that back to group.

### **3. Peer Review Consultant Contract Request for Proposal (RFP) – Craig Lamothe**

Craig Lamothe provided an overview of peer review consultant contract request for proposal (RFP). The presentation covered PRC procurement schedule, PRC scope of work and PRC independent reviews.

Q: Is it just design or will construction be a part of the reviewing?

A: Just design.

Q: Will you have another peer review consultant for construction?

A: We have internal construction staff that we are bringing onboard; when we get to the point of construction they will be providing the oversight out in the field of the various different constructors that we will have on this project. This is because of the interest in the safety aspect particularly of the bridge features of the project. We just want to have that added level of insurance that we are building something that is going to last.

Q: Are you able to capture a peer review from the one percent of work that was done previously?

Is there any way to capture that information so before they get too deep into the 30% design you have the opportunity to maybe take a look at that 1% and apply those learning's to this next step?

A: In terms of the LPA that will be the first product that the consultants will be looking at because they will be building from that. There's going to be an evaluation of that LPA as we begin our work.

### **4. Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Environmental Program Update – Nani Jacobsen**

Nani Jacobson provided overview of environmental program update through a presentation. The presentation covered DEIS schedule, DEIS public hearing dates and locations, DEIS summary of comments examples of themes, DEIS public comment process, responsible government unit authority, FEIS consultant procurement schedule, FEIS consultant scope of work, and environmental look ahead.

Q: Where are sites that are identified located? How many?

A: We have the final report and generally because of the sensitivity of the information in the report it is not something that we traditionally like to broadcast, but we do want to work with the property owners so, we can discuss the locations. There are a half dozen or so.

Q: These are properties that theoretically you couldn't do anything with because they would be seen as historically important structures?

A: These would be buried underground, according to the archaeological survey. We would be looking at ways to avoid, minimizing or mitigate impacts. We work very closely with State Historical Preservation office as well as MN Department of Transportation's Culture Resources Unit and FTA to determine what needs to be done to these various locations.

Q: Can you provide an example of what might be underground?

A: Historical railroad infrastructures, etc.

Q: Not burial grounds actual physical structures?

A: No. Generally related to prior uses for freight railroad industry, pre-contact, post-contact as well as post-contact European Settlers.

Chair Will Roach asked Sam if in March the group could review public comment information. Sam responded that Nani does have plans to make DEIS comments available. Nani stated that comments will be up on website in the next week or so.

## **5. 2013 BAC Meeting Schedule**

Sam O'Connell proposed moving the meeting date to last Wednesday of the month to help the group's goals and mission of being able to provide guidance; input and better share information between the various committees. The change would go into effect March 27, 2013. February joint meeting will be held with BAC, CAC and CSC groups. Chair Will Roach explained to group what CMC meeting is and who is involved. Group agreed to move date of meetings to last Wednesday of the month.

## **6. Topics of Interest Survey Results**

Sam O'Connell shared the group's survey results, four key concerns and issues.

1. Station location/platform connections
2. Land Use
3. Tied: Business outreach, parking, station and platform designs, traffic impacts
4. Tied: Lessons learned from Hiawatha and Central PE, trails/parks/bike facility impacts, transit-oriented-development.

Q: Are these in ranked order or the top four?

A: These are ranked order.

## **7. Definition of BAC Success**

Will Roach, asked group what thoughts they have on measuring success. How will we know in a few years if we were successful?

Comment: Everything seems to be asking us what we want; my understanding of an advisory committee is what does the SWLRT planning office want, what do they need us for, not what we need from them but what they need us for, otherwise this is really a of an agenda rather than an actual advisory. I shouldn't be defining what they want from us. I just know what I want as a measure of success but that is not an advisory committee it's maybe an advocacy committee. I keep hearing that you want our input, when are we going to get input other than what we want our input about?

A: It is a timing issue. We need to let time play out so we can start appropriately adding subject matter topics. With the next joint meeting with CAC/CSC we will see a timeline and thought on how we start identifying key milestones and input for some of those decisions and criteria's. We need level of patience.

Comment: Don't' think measuring is going to be easily defined. What are the key deliverables and how do we measure on these deliverables? What about a sub-committee?

Q: Other than getting it built, funded and having a functional alignment, the people that are overseeing the whole process what makes looking back over three, four or five years from now when the line is done, how are they going to

judge whether or not it was a success? How will they measure the success, what criteria will they use to determine if it is a success?

A: A speaker can come in to share broader information to group concerning the various criteria's, etc.

Another way to figure out the measure success is to ask yourself how will this affect your constituents, how does this impact the broader SW corridor project and how does this impact the businesses within the region and broader region, We need to continue to think of ways to think of success as how do we advocate, communicate business outreach, job creation, the funding mechanisms, etc.

## **8. Member & Committee Reports**

Chair Will Roach discussed success measures with Chair Haigh, thanked group for their input  
Sam will send information concerning sub-committee group information that was discussed.

## **9. Public Forum**

Beth Jameston introduced herself and added to the topic measure of success. Beth talked about the workforce development of jobs and issues, what can be done to ensure that information is out there, what potentially workforce can do to reach the various areas for development, how do we work with education to make sure that the workers are there? Beth noted that she is listening in on the different committees and trying to figure out where workforce group will be helpful.

Q: Freight rail identified issues in comment period is there a possibility of changes?

A: LPA is what we have to work with through PE. There are no preconceived notions or premature conclusions.

Q: Can you send out contact list of everyone's names on project?

A: BAC Roster is located on website with member's information.

**10. Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned at 9:30 AM. Next meeting is scheduled for February 21, 2013 joint meeting with the CAC.