



## Red Rock Corridor Commission Implementation Workshop Minutes/Notes Thursday July 31, 2014

<b>Commission Members</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Present</b>
Autumn Lehrke, Chair	Washington County RRA	X
Mike Slavik	Dakota County RRA	X
Janice Rettman	Ramsey County RRA	X
Linda Higgins	Hennepin County RRA	
Barb Hollenbeck	City of Hastings	X
Jen Peterson, Vice-Chair	City of Cottage Grove	X
Keith Franke	City of St. Paul Park	
Steve Gallagher	City of Newport	X
Jim Keller	Denmark Township	
Cam Gordon	City of Minneapolis	
Amy Brendmoen	City of St. Paul	

<b>Ex-Officio Members</b>	<b>Agency</b>	
Marc Mogan	Prairie Island Indian Community	X
Jess Greenwood	Goodhue County	

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Present</b>
Jan Lucke	Washington County RRA	X
Andy Gitzlaff	Washington County RRA	
Lyssa Leitner	Washington County RRA	X
Joe Morneau	Dakota County RRA	
Josh Olson	Ramsey County RRA	X

<b>Others</b>	<b>Agency</b>
Katie White	Met Council
Lynne Bly	MnDOT
Chuck Darnell	Hennepin County
Karla Bigham	
Steve Dennis	
William Leffner	
Rep. Katie Sieben	

### **Agenda Item #1: Introductions**

Introductions were made by those present.

### **Agenda Item #2: Overview**

Lehrke provided an overview of the workshops. The Alternatives Analysis Update (AAU) provided great data for the determination that bus rapid transit is a mode of transit that should be implemented in the Red Rock Corridor. The AAU suggested a staged implementation plan. This workshop will be the first step to get us thinking about what tangible items the Commission needs to engage in during the coming years to implement additional transit in the corridor. We will hear from three different perspectives today that will help us with the facilitated discussion portion of the workshop today. Please review the questions that were provided to us so we are prepared for that section later on in the workshop. Jan Lucke is going to lead us in this workshop.

### **Agenda Item #3: Transit Development Presentations**

- a. Federal Perspective - Jeff Boothe, Chair, New Starts Working Group and Partner, Holland & Knight – Joining us via Skype  
See Exhibit A
- b. Regional Perspective - Mary Richardson, CTIB Administrator and Partner, Richardson, Richter and Associates  
See Exhibit B and C
- c. Local Perspective – Kristine Elwood, Transit and Multi-Modal Programs Manager, Dakota County and Red Line Project Manager  
See Exhibit D

### **Agenda Item #4: Facilitated Discussion**

Jan Lucke facilitated the discussion. Below is a summary of the discussion and questions raised during the agenda items.

#### *Questions for Presenters:*

Slavik asked Boothe, what would be your thought about what will happen with congress? Boothe responded, the house rejected the senate amendment to extend Map 21. The senate proposed the program that would have brought it to the end of the year. The house bill extends Map 21 to May of next year. The house rejected the senate proposal and adopted its own rules and sent it back to the senate. The senate is likely to adopt the house proposal so we will have an extension on Map 21 to the end of May of next year. We will wait until after the election to see what the impact of the election will be. The principal focus being on if the senate remains in democratic hands or pushes over to the republicans creating the dynamic break. Boothe doesn't see that there will be any effort to raise the gas tax.

Leitner asked a clarifying question to Boothe. You talked about the criteria for New Starts and Small Starts; can you talk about the competition? Since New and Small Starts are not guaranteed funding sources, the funding is something you need to be competitive around the nation. Boothe responded, Small Starts projects that are under about \$75 – \$80 Million and are generally matched 80/20. Once you start getting about \$75 -\$80 Million the county is usually expected to come in with over match. Projects under \$50 Million typically get their money over 1 – 2 years, where projects that are seeking \$75 million+ are often funded for 3 fiscal years.

Rettman asked Richardson if CTIB is giving us a much better hope than 2 years ago. Richardson responded that the transit way improvement approach provides greater flexibility. You don't have to march down the path from planning to design to engineering to building. You have a little bit more flexibility when you need it. You don't have to follow the typical transitway development process.

Lehrke asked Richardson to talk about how the Red Rock Corridor differs from Gateway, Cedar Avenue Bus Rapid Transit, Red Line, etc. Are these projects considered transitways when Red Rock isn't? Richardson responded that the Red Line is going to be considered a transitway as well because they will have a staged implementation plan. They will take a look at the needs, prioritize and build what they need over a period of time. When we took a look at working with your staff from the AAU, the plan appeared to be an implementation plan like the Red Line. CTIB didn't have the distinction between the two plans when the Red Line was first built but we provided the project funding for the shoulder we committed to pay 30% of the shoulder improvements and a big chunk of the Apple Valley Station. We will be also considering the changes to the Cedar Grove station. Gateway is being developed in the New Starts process and is not being implemented bit by bit. In order to go through the New Starts, you take the whole project from start to finish.

Rettman asked the five years that you had enough money to do this, is that for the whole 5 years for all of the projects that are both in the New Starts as well as in the transitways columns? Richardson confirmed that it's a 5 year plan. CTIB has enough funding to pay their share of both the transitway and transitway improvement projects.

#### *Facilitated Discussion*

Below is a summary of the discussion from the facilitated discussion.

- *What new or surprising information did you learn from the experts?*
  - The Red Line implementation plan was a list of priorities with costs and a living document
  - We need more details for Red Rock
  - Red Line is already at next step of planning
  - We don't have to do everything all at once
- *What opportunities and/or challenges does this information bring for the Red Rock Corridor?*
  - Cost Effectiveness
  - Economic Development
  - We are on the right track
  - Federal funding is a challenge
  - CTIB changes are an opportunity
  - Take what has been done & build on it – don't recreate
  - Want regional balance of 50/50 investment on the east and west
- *In order to take the next steps for transitway development in the Red Rock Corridor, what additional information do you as a Commission need?*
  - Need to confirm where money for construction & operating are coming from
  - Look at the Transportation Policy Plan
  - Exceptions and what communities are willing to put in
  - Need ideas on who we can tap for additional funding options
  - What are the next steps to enter into the Locally Preferred Alternative process
  - See what phased approach looks like
- *What are the respective roles of the Commission, counties and cities in transitway implementation?*
  - Have partnership & support from each level of government

- Keep larger partnership for entire implementation
  - Cities land use planning – letters of support
- *What actionable items can the Commission integrate into their work plan for 2015 and beyond? What is most important to achieve in 2015?*
  - Stronger commission support of Hastings to get transit taxing district
  - Determine the right level of service and when it should be implemented
  - Have all of our ducks in a row for CTIB schedule
  - Station planning for BRT, do not re-do the original station planning altogether
- *Going forward, do you see a need to update the structure of the Commission?*
  - Relook at list of partners and their roles
  - Need of express bus/future transit to Minneapolis

**Agenda Item #5: Next Steps**

Lucke explained that staff will take the information that was discussed today and bring a summary and next steps to the August Commission meeting.

**Agenda Item #6: Adjourn**

Motion to adjourn by Hollenback Seconded by Slavik  
All in favor, meeting adjourned.