

## EXECUTIVE CHANGE CONTROL BOARD

Monday, January 26, 2015

1:00 pm – 2:30 pm

### Meeting Minutes

---

---

**Voting Representatives Present:** Adam Duininck, Jan Callison, Marion Greene, Peter McLaughlin, Scott Schulte, Nancy Schouweiler

**Non-Voting Representatives Present:** Jason Gadd, Terry Schneider, Anne Mavity, Jenifer Hager, Kathy Nelson

Chair Adam Duininck opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

#### Opening Remarks

Chair Duininck welcomed those in attendance, followed by introductions.

Commissioner Jan Callison asked if her previous question regarding ability to vote by conference call had been addressed. Mark Fuhrmann stated they are working with the Hennepin County Attorney's Office and a response is being researched.

#### Approval of December 18, 2014 Minutes

Meeting Minutes were adopted.

#### Adopt Bylaws

Jan Callison requested clarification of definition of 'regional system benefit'. Melanie Steinborn explained that it is one of the criteria for eligibility of a Locally Requested Capital Investment (LRCI). It is a transportation item that affects the regional transit system, not just a specific location. Mayor Terry Schneider asked if we approved ridership for the line in general, is that a regional benefit? Steinborn responded that ridership would be a specific criteria and wouldn't necessarily need to meet the regional system benefit. Commissioner Peter McLaughlin provided an example from Central Corridor LRT where contingency was used to buy cars. The cars provide more capacity for the individual line and are interchangeable so that it does back up the pre-existing line. Craig Lamothe stated the system being referred to is the regional transit system. Commissioner McLaughlin stated the reference to regional transit system is consistent with how Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) intended. Nancy Schouweiler moved to approve the Bylaws. Scott Schulte second it. Bylaws were been approved and adopted.

#### Report of Eligibility Assessment of the List of LRCIs

Melanie Steinborn presented the list of LRCIs that the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) members deemed eligible items as well as the LRCIs deemed ineligible. The original list included 33 LRCIs. The TAG meeting on January 8 and 15 looked at the list and determined that 14 items were deemed eligible for contingency. 10 were ineligible, 3 100% non-FFGA local funding, and 6 100% non-FFGA local funding and constructed outside of the SWLRT project.

In Eden Prairie, LRCI numbers 1, 2, 3 and 26 were found to be eligible. LRCI numbers 4 through 10 were considered ineligible.

Referring to LRCI 9, Kathy Nelson stated that it would have been safer for pedestrians, and the aesthetics would be keeping up with the rest of the local area. She further stated that it may be something to consider in the long run for the health of the whole line. She also mentioned LRCI 6 was a slight upgrade, but other cities have received such improvements in the past. Eden Prairie made the determination that they would fund LRCI 11 separately. Hennepin County will fund LRCI 27 100%.

Commissioner Callison asked if the Board was deciding if these LRCIs are never eligible, or are they just unlikely in case additional funds become available. Craig Lamothe commented the project must move forward with the design, environmental clearance and construction schedule. The Board needs to make the determination if the ineligible LRCIs can be reviewed at a later date. Commissioner McLaughlin's recommendation is to consider the ineligible LRCIs off the table. Scott Schulte commented that contingency funds should be for correcting issues that weren't known previously, and not used for wants or aesthetics. It was suggested that the cities and/or county start looking for other sources of funding for the ineligible LRCIs.

In Minnetonka and Hopkins, LRCI numbers 12, 13, 16, and 28 were found to be eligible. Numbers 14 and 15 were ineligible. Terry Schneider stated the reason for number 14 and 15 is because of the likelihood of future construction. He strongly suggests and requests these improvements be incorporated now when the cost will be significantly lower than having the work done later.

Jan Callison asked why some of the LRCIs had Xs in more than one criteria, but others did not. Melanie Steinborn explained that it meant the TAG couldn't narrow down to which specific criteria they fell under, as they could fall under all 4. It does not mean one LRCI is rated higher than the other. Ranking would happen after contingency is awarded.

Peter McLaughlin asked about LRCI number 13. Mark Fuhrmann gave the analogy of American Boulevard Station in Bloomington. He stated that as part of the base project below ground infrastructure was put in, with the understanding that future funding may be become available for a new station. It's a minimal investment at this time to preclude a large expense later. At Smetana the discussion with the city and their engineers is that we would grade the track so it's level to allow for a future station and do some retaining wall work.

Jason Gadd discussed LRCI number 14. It is to allow for expansion in the future. There are no road or sanitary sewer connections for that area - instead of redoing the road at a later time, put it in at the time that road is being created. He stated that LRCI 15 was to have power lines buried so they didn't interfere with future construction.

In St. Louis Park, LRCI numbers 17, 18, 19, and 33 were found to be eligible. Number 32 was ineligible. Anne Mavity stated that for LRCI 32, safety, circulation and access are a critical part of the project. Craig Lamothe stated that some of the road changes that are already in the designs are to allow additional capacity for drivers to get to the Park and Ride. Peter McLaughlin asked about fiber conduits. Mark Fuhrmann stated that as long as the conduit is within the Right of Way, there would be no additional charges.

Chair Adam Duininck suggested we vote yes or no for the LRCI list. Marion Green felt a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier list would be good to save work later for this group in case there is a need to address them in the future. Peter McLaughlin stated that having a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier list gives an inappropriate level of hope. If we do not have a 2<sup>nd</sup> tier list then the cities can move forward with identifying alternative funding. Craig Lamothe commented that the sponsors of the ineligible LRCIs need to make the decision to fund construction. The LRCI list will most likely not come back to the ECCB unless contingency becomes available.

Jan Callison motioned for approval of the LRCI list. Peter McLaughlin seconded it. The LRCI list was adopted.

#### Next Steps

Another meeting will be scheduled for a future date when necessary.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:30 pm.