



**Agenda**  
**Red Rock Corridor Commission**  
**February 25, 2010**  
**3:30 p.m.**

Cottage Grove City Hall, Council Chambers  
7516 80<sup>th</sup> Street South  
Cottage Grove, MN

---

|  | <u>Action Requested</u> |
|--|-------------------------|
| 1. Consent Items                                       | Approval                |
| a. Minutes of the December 10, 2009 Meeting*           |                         |
| b. Minutes of the January 28, 2010 Meeting*            |                         |
| 2. 2010 Workplan and Budget* - WCRRA                   | Approval                |
| 3. Reaffirm CAC Appointments* - WCRRA                  | Approval                |
| 4. Station Planning Study – TOD Overview - Hay Dobbs   | Discussion              |
| 5. Minnesota High Speed Rail Commission Update – RCRRA | Information             |
| 6. Legislative Update – WCRRA                          | Information             |
| a. State   |                         |
| b. Federal*  |                         |
| 7. Resolutions of Support* - WCRRA                     | Approval                |
| a. High Speed Rail Federal Appropriation Request       |                         |
| b. Hoffman Yard Federal Appropriation Request          |                         |
| c. Red Rock Bus Service Federal Appropriation Request  |                         |
| 8. Chapter 152 Solicitation* - WCRRA                   | Information             |
| 9. Other   | Information             |

\* *Enclosures*



**Meeting Minutes**  
**January 10, 2009**  
**Washington County South Service Center**  
**Cottage Grove**  
**3:30 p.m.**

---

**Members Present:**

Myra Peterson, Washington County  
Liz Workman, Dakota County  
Myron Bailey, City of Cottage Grove  
Janice Rettman, Ramsey County  
John Hunziker, City of St. Paul Park  
Barb Hollenbeck, City of Hastings  
Lee Helgen, City of St Paul  
Jim Keller, Denmark Township

**Ex-Officio Members Present:**

Bob Kastner, Red Wing  
Marc Mogan, Prairie Island Indian Community  
Ken Bjornstad, Goodhue County

**Others Present:**

Josh Olson, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority  
Andy Gitzlaff, Washington County Regional Railroad Authority  
Tom Dobbs, Hay Dobbs  
Allen Lovejoy, City of St Paul  
Robert Vockrodt, MnDOT Metro District  
Howard Blin, Cottage Grove  
Phil Pasterak, Parsons Brinkerhoff  
Dean Michalko, Hennepin County  
Darin Broton, Tunheim Partners  
Brian Anderson, City of Newport  
Jon Solberg, MnDOT Metro District

---

Chair Peterson called the meeting to order at 3:36 pm.

**Agenda Item #1    New Commission Members**

Commission Chair Peterson introduced and welcomed new commission members.

**Agenda Item #2    Election of Officers**

A motion was made by Commission Member Hunziker to elect Commission Member Myra Peterson as the Chair for the Red Rock Corridor Commission. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Keller, and a motion was made by Commission Member Hunziker to close the nominations and move to proceed with a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Commission Member Hunziker to elect Commission Member Harris as the Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Workman.

A motion was made to close the nominations and move to proceed with a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Agenda Item #3 Consent Items**

Commission Member Hunziker moved the approval of the Consent Items. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Member Rettman and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Agenda Item #4 Legislative Update- WCRRA**

#### **a. State**

Commission Chair Peterson informed the Commission that she and Commission Member Hollenbeck recently testified before the Senate and today before the House Bonding committees. They both agreed it was a very positive experience. Commission Member Hollenbeck indicated she was appreciative of the encouragement by the representatives specifically in regards to the decision to build the park-and-ride directly in the downtown area of Hastings versus outside of town.

Andy Gitzlaff expanded on those comments to detail that the bill that was testified on was the \$500,000 bonding request the design and construction of park-and-ride facilities along the Red Rock Corridor. Even though the session doesn't begin until February 2, both the House and Senate indicated they want to complete this bonding bill very soon.

#### **b. Federal**

Andy Gitzlaff informed the Commission that the announcement came through today for the approval of stimulus funds for the high speed rail route from the Twin Cities to Chicago:

- \$833 million total.
- \$820 million for the Milwaukee to Madison extension.
- \$12 million for Chicago to Milwaukee improvements.
- The remaining \$1 million for high level environmental alternative analysis from Madison to the Twin Cities.

•  
He emphasized that this is a very critical event for the Corridor Commission and the State today. Commission Chair Peterson encouraged all members to go their own caucuses and town hall meetings and talk about the importance of high speed, commuter and freight rail.

### **Agenda Item #5 Red Rock 2010 Legislative Platform-WCRRA**

Mr. Gitzlaff referred the Commission to review the Red Rock Corridor 2010 Legislative Platform. He indicated this is an updated version since the first review at the December meeting. Since the December meeting revisions and additions have been made based on some of the Commission Members requests to make this a more relevant document. He presented to the Commission a highlight of the requested changes:

- In regards to the \$500,000 request for environmental analysis, engineering, acquisition of real property or interest, and construction of a park and ride facility along the Red Rock Corridor Transit Way, we have expanded the focus of the area to include the entire Red Rock Corridor instead of just the Hastings area. This would allow us flexibility to use these funds for additional eligible projects, although Hastings remains the priority project for park-and-ride construction with those funds.
- A request for \$3,600,000 for the implementation for 3-year commuter bus service from Hastings to St. Paul and Minneapolis. This is a mitigation measure during the time when Highway 61 is under construction. We did add this item is not an eligible bonding request; therefore, we need to be looking for operation dollars and have those dollars come out of other sources such as the general fund, which probably won't happen this year due to the states deficit. Another avenue is general highway funds for bridge mitigation since the park-and-ride is adjacent to a state highway.
- The third request is a support statement for the planning and development for high speed rail along the river corridor. This statement has been expanded to include support for the Ramsey County Regional Rail Authority, for \$10 million for high speed rail from the Twin Cities to Chicago.
- New support statements include support for the request of \$8.5 million by Ramsey County to match federal funds for environmental, engineering, and property acquisition for the Union Depot hub and support for Ramsey County for \$13.5 million to be allocated to MnDot for the Hoffman Yard, which is a major bottleneck that both passenger and freight rail service.

Commission Member Bailey moved the approval of the legislative platform. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Member Hunziker and the motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item #6 Station Area and Site Master Planning Overview-Hay Dobbs**  
**a. CAC Appointments**

Tom Dobbs of Hay Dobbs presented a brief review of the current project status via a power point. He stated that building advocacy, support, and awareness for the project is really the key component to the success of the project.

Darren Broton of Tunheim Partners presented an overview on the new Red Rock Corridor website soon to be launched. Mr. Broton also discussed the upcoming press conference on Monday February 8, 2010 in room 181 at the State Office Building. He also mentioned that they are in the process of designing an electronic newsletter for supporters to help people learn more about the Red Rock Corridor and keep them aware of upcoming events and changes that may be occurring.

Commission Chair Peterson indicated that the cities have appointed members to the Citizens Advisory Committee. Andy stated the list is not in front of him but will get that printed and distributed to all members.

Commission Chair Peterson suggested appointing Sandi Dingle to the Citizen Advisory Committee. Commission Member Hunziker made a motion to appoint Sandy Dingo to the Citizen Advisory Commission. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Workman and passed unanimously.

## **Agenda Item #7 Minneapolis Interchange Project Overview- HCRRA**

Commission Chair Peterson introduced Dean Michalko with Hennepin County Regional Rail Authority and Phil Pasterak and Chuck Collins with PB America to discuss planning for the Minneapolis interchange transit hub.

Mr. Michalko distributed a brochure that included an overview of the transit lines we are envisioning someday coming into the area where the Northstar Commuter Rail line and the Hiawatha LRT line currently converge. Mr. Michalko stated that they are planning for the future and setting the stage for a potential full build-out area for when additional services come online, like Red Rock, Northern Lights Express to Duluth, and high speed rail. Currently, \$52 million of local money is being used to prepare for passenger rail, including things like the Cedar Lake Bike Trail, to help get people to this area for transfers to buses, automobiles, high speed rail, and light rail.

Mr. Pasterak presented data through a power point presentation explaining where the study for the interchange is at now. He presented the forecasted commuter/intercity/light rail train operations for station sizing. He indicated the process for this study is due to be completed in May of 2010. He indicated it is important for them to listen to the needs of the community, corridors, and everybody involved in the complex undertaking of this transit process. Railroad freight operations are an important link to the success of the passenger trains as the tracks are owned by the freight operations. It is important to understand their operations and how it affects passenger lines. Additionally, he showed a slide that indicated all the lines that flowed directly into the proposed interchange. He indicated that one of the next items they will be doing is a capacity study to determine how many trains they can fit in the station. Additionally, they will examine alternative station sites.

Commission Member Workman asked when is there just too much stuff coming into the station area. Mr. Pasterak indicated that a big part of the study is to determine the capacity analysis of how many trains, tracks, and platforms will actually work.

Commission Chair Peterson commented that we need to recognize that we are a region and that we need to tie the region together. These hubs are important for the connectivity of the region, and if they are planned and utilized well, it will encourage transit orientated development around those areas.

## **Agenda Item #8 Draft State Rail Plan Final Report Comments**

Commission Chair Peterson referred the members to the draft comment letter in the packet. Commission Member Rettman wanted Commission Members to refer to Chapter 7 under financial plan, and is concerned with the statement reading ‘no more than 25% of operations should be subsidized by the state and if there is a gap the County’s Rail Authority could make it up.’ Commission Member Workman offered that the Dakota County Rail Authority met on Tuesday and they also agreed that this is not acceptable and suggested to put a period after the word “State”. Commission Member Rettman requested to have this changed in the draft.

Andy Gitzlaff, indicated that a similar discussion occurred with the Washington County Board, and they would like to rewrite this paragraph to strengthen it by moving the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence down and adding a statement that no cost participation for operations should be assumed or considered from regional rail authorities.

Member Chair Peterson reminded that we are responsible for the development of stations and to help market them, but we are not operationally responsible for high speed rail.

Commission Member Rettman still voiced her concern with leaving the words the “county rail authority could make it up” Andy indicates that can be removed.

Commission Member Peterson asked the staff to rewrite that paragraph. Commission Member Rettman motioned to change the paragraph and send the letter. The motion was seconded by Commission Member Workman and passed unanimously.

## **Agenda Item #9 Administration**

### **a. 2009 Budget Summary**

Mr. Gitzlaff referred to the budget documents for 2009. He referenced the starting balance of \$161,000 and the ending balance of \$97,000. The majority of the costs were for the commuter bus feasibility study that was completed last year. At this time, there is enough fund balance to go into this next year, so we are not anticipating a need to ask for additional funds from the Counties.

### **b. Draft 2010 Work plan and Budget**

Mr. Gitzlaff stated that last month we reviewed the 2010 work plan and budget which had a lot of upcoming projects and studies. In order to maximize the use of both state and federal funds He recommends working on finalizing the 2010 work plan and budget by calling a meeting of the Executive Committee, which is a recommending body that consists of the four funding partners– Hennepin, Washington, Ramsey, and Dakota Counties. Mr. Gitzlaff stated that the goal would be to have 2010 budget and work finalized and on the agenda for approval by the full Commission at the February meeting. He indicated that Commission Chair Peterson needs to formally call a special meeting and the staff would make the arrangements. All Commission Members could attend. Commission Chair Peterson called for the special executive committee meeting.

**Agenda Item #10 Other**

**a. Invitations for Ex-Officio membership**

Commission Chair Peterson informed the Commission that at the breakfast meeting last Friday there was a gentleman from Prescott there and they discussed with him joining the Commission. She would like to formally send an invitation to the City of Prescott to join as an Ex-Officio member. Additionally, she would like to suggest that we send a letter to Pierce County and ask them also if they would like to participate as an Ex-officio member.

**b. APTA High Speed Rail Conference Chicago 2/9 – 2/11**

Commission Chair Peterson reminded all Commission Members of the APTA High Speed Rail Conference in Chicago on 2/9-2/11. Commission Member Rettman and McDonough both will be in attendance.

Commission Member Hollenbeck stated her appreciation for the Commission allowing her to testify at the legislature recently. She indicated that the City of Hastings appreciated the support of the Commission behind this bill.

Commission Member Hopkins moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Member Bailey and passed unanimously.

The Commission adjourned at 4:42 p.m.



**Meeting Minutes**  
**December 10, 2009**  
**Washington County South Service Center**  
**Cottage Grove**  
**3:30 p.m.**

---

**Members Present:**

Myra Peterson, Washington County  
Joe Harris, Dakota County  
Jim McDonough, Ramsey County  
Lee Helgen, City of St Paul  
Corbin Hopkins, City of Newport  
Barb Hollenbeck, City of Hastings  
Jim Keller, Denmark Township  
John Hunziker, St Paul Park

**Others Present:**

Josh Olson, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority  
Andy Gitzlaff, Washington County Regional Railroad Authority  
Steve Elmer, Met Council  
Allen Lovejoy, City of St Paul Public Works  
Robert Vockrodt, MnDOT Metro District  
Michelle Dibble, Transit for Livable Communities  
Tom Dobbs, Hay Dobbs  
Tom Johnson, Hay Dobbs  
Dave Christianson, MnDOT

**Ex-Officio Members Present:**

Bob Kastner, Red Wing  
Marc Mogan, Prairie Island Indian Community  
Ken Bjornstad, Goodhue County

---

Chair Peterson called the meeting to order at 3:41 pm.

**Agenda Item #1    Consent Items**

An invoice from Hay-Dobbs was added to the Checks and Claims. Commission Member Hunziker moved the approval of the Consent Items. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Member Keller and passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item #2    Station Area Planning Study Overview– Hay Dobbs**

Mr. Dobbs presented a power point presentation on the overview of the Red Rock Corridor Process. Commission Member Helgen questioned the ability to add extra stops along the way. Mr. Gitzlaff informed the Commission that the federal grant limits us to the stops that are included now. Additionally, extra stops will slow down the commuter rail train service.

Commission Chair Peterson reminded all that appointment to the Citizens Advisory Committee would be made at the January meeting. She also asked Mr. Dobbs if he has considered young people, like students, that may be using the line for school in this group. He indicated that they have discussed including this group throughout the public involvement process.

Commission Member McDonough questions if we could reach out to those that currently use the lower Afton bus facility or park and ride, via flyers to get them involved in this Advisory Group. Commission Chair Peterson also added that we need businesses to support the rail system. Mr. Dobbs indicated that the cities that are directly affected with the rail are the cities that we want the Citizen's Advisory Committee to come from. Commissioner Member Peterson proposes that we have the names of anyone that could be on the Citizen's Advisory Committee by January 5, 2010.

### **Agenda Item #3 State Rail Plan Stake holder Input- MN/DOT**

Dave Christianson, representing MN/DOT, gave an update on the State Rail Plan. He reminded that developing criteria for rail investment is important. Commission Member McDonough asked, if MN/Dot will prioritize where the investment should start occurring. Mr. Christianson explained that Mn-Dot will be advancing the 6 priority corridors simultaneously.

Additionally, Commission Member McDonough asked if the state rail plan will give specific recommendations as to where the federal dollars will go. Mr. Christianson reminded the Commission that all passenger rail must go through St. Paul and Minneapolis. MN/Dot feels this is a wise investment. Commission Member McDonough added that the area is more of a metropolitan area region than two distinct cities and questions if it makes sense to develop both as passenger hubs as it is a huge investment. Mr. Christianson responded that MN/Dot's main concern is what is best for the traveler, and their position is to have both St. Paul and Minneapolis as a connection for the convenience of the traveler.

Commission Chair Peterson questioned that the report doesn't reference the investment MN/Dot has already put into the corridor. Mr. Christianson stated that this number is not referenced in the report because we are not at a corridor level. He also noted that the report reflects the current success of the Amtrak Empire Builder and includes the updated data for the Red Rock Corridor.

Commission Chair Peterson asked if there is a commitment at MN/Dot to invest in rail as a viable mode and how they prepared to go forward. Mr. Christianson indicated that the current administration is very committed to the development of rail.

### **Agenda Item #4 Legislative Update**

#### **a. State**

Andy Gitzlaff informed the Commission that the new legislative session will be starting the second week in February and a lot of the committees are doing their fact finding right now. There was meeting on 11/17/09 in Minneapolis which included a tour of the Ballpark Station. A presentation was given to the legislative body about the bonding

requests and one of the requests was the \$500,000 request for the Red Rock Park and Ride in Hastings.

#### **b. Federal**

Mr. Gitzlaff explained that there has been some development on the re-authorization process of the Surface Transportation Bill. The administration and the senate have been pushing for an extension of 18 months, and it appears a compromise of six months is the route congress is headed at this time.

Additionally, Mr. Gitzlaff asked the Commission Members to review their packets, and a press release from the US Secretary of Transportation for a \$280 million grant program for Urban Circulator Projects such as street cars and buses that support community development and increase quality of life while creating jobs. This is joint effort with the US Department of Transportation, the Housing and Urban Development Department and the Environmental Protection Agency. This may be a new source of money that may become available as early as next year in the form of grants. Mr. Gitzlaff stated that staff will continue to monitor it to see if any of these funds will be applicable to Red Rock.

#### **Agenda Item #5 Red Rock 2010 Legislative Platform-WCRRRA**

Mr. Gitzlaff reminded all of strategic planning workshop that occurred earlier this year to determine what the corridor commission should be focusing their energies on. The results of that workshop indicated there are three priorities, two funding priorities, and one policy:

Mr. Gitzlaff referred Commission Members to the packets that contain a summary of these specific requests for review, and they will be brought up in the January meeting to formally adopt.

Commission Member Harris questioned Mr. Gitzlaff in regards to his statements about the closure of the Hastings Bridge while there is construction of a new bridge. Commissioner Harris stated that he was concerned that we were overstating the effects of the bridge construction. Mr. Gitzlaff stated that he may have misspoke and referred the Commission to the actual language in the legislative platform that stated that the following "While it is anticipated that there will not be a reduction in the travel lanes, the construction impacts could be expected to create significant congestion through the area. The construction of a park-and-ride with bus service to Hastings could help to mitigate the congestion that may be associated with the construction project." Commission Member Harris expressed his comfort with the revised statement.

Commission Chair Peterson asked all to review the legislative platform for red Rock prior to the start of legislative session.

#### **Agenda Item #6 Administration**

##### **a. 2009 Budget Summary**

Mr. Gitzlaff presented the budget summary as detailed in the packet.

b. Draft 2010 Work Plan and Budget

Mr. Gitzlaff gave a brief review of the 2010 Work Plan and Budget. He indicated that a rough draft is included in the packets for review and all members should be prepared to vote on this for final approval and adoption at the January meeting.

c. 2010 Meeting Schedule

Commission Chair Peterson suggested holding the meeting on Nov 18, 2010 as an alternative to Nov 25, 2010 scheduled date which is Thanksgiving.

Motion was made by Commission Member Hunziker to approve the 2010 Meeting Schedule and suggest that Nov 18 as the alternate date to Nov 25, 2010. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Member Hopkins and passed unanimously.

The Commission adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

# Red Rock Corridor Commission 2010 Work Plan and Budget

Status: For Approval, February 25, 2010

## 1. **General Activities**

The Red Rock Corridor Commission (RRCC) will work with corridor municipalities, the Metropolitan Council, Metro Transit, and the Minnesota Department of Transportation to continue the advancement of the Red Rock Corridor. To accomplish this, the RRCC will do the following:

1. Offer guidance on corridor studies
2. Coordinate corridor studies with Minnesota Department of Transportation, Metropolitan Council, Metro Transit, and other interested parties
3. Monitor progress on corridor studies
4. Offer formal comments as needed;

## 2. **Southeast Station Area and Site Master Planning and Environmental Analysis (Currently Underway)**

The work being conducted for this study will be utilized in the development of station areas that can serve express bus service in the interim and transition to commuter rail as it is implemented. These stations include Lower Afton Road (St Paul), Newport, Cottage Grove and Hastings. Public education and involvement will also be a key component of this project. The key items in the scope of work include the following tasks:

- Public Education and Involvement
- Corridor Website Development
- Corridor and Station Visualization
- Preparation of Station Area and Site Plans
- Environmental Analysis and Documentation
- Market and Transit Oriented-Development Analysis
- Construction, Operating and Maintenance Cost Estimates
- Transit Oriented Development Implementation Guide

The Washington County Regional Railroad Authority is the contract manager for the study. The study, which began in October 2009, will be completed in the Spring of 2011.

**3. East Metro Railroad Capacity Analysis Study (To Be Started Soon)**

This study will evaluate railroad capacity and determine engineering improvements needed to implement Amtrak, commuter rail, Midwest Regional Rail (high speed), and freight movements north and east of downtown St. Paul. Within a half-mile of the downtown St. Paul and Union Depot, five percent (5%) of all U.S. Freight Rail traffic moves through the Hoffman Ave. Interlocking. Three Class 1 Railroads, as well as regional Short Line carriers, operate on trackage rights in this area. Hoffman Ave. Interlocking is a major rail freight operations bottleneck. The RRCC and stakeholder railroads recognize current and future rail capacity constraints have to address this bottleneck in order to achieve long term plans for high-speed, inter-city and commuter rail connections to Union Depot. This study will be very beneficial to establishing a collaborative working relationship with the railroads for identifying solutions that could accommodate all desired uses.

The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority will be the contract manager for the study. The Red Rock Corridor Commission will be a project partner for this study and be involved in the decision-making process.

**4. Public Involvement**

The Commission's public involvement activities will be separate from, but closely coordinated with the Station Area and Site Master Planning study. The Commission's activities will include:

1. Public Involvement as identified in the Station Area and Site Master Planning Workslope.
2. Presentations to civic and community groups throughout the Corridor.
3. Distribution of newsletters and project updates at various public events including fairs and community festivals.
4. Media recognition of Commission meetings and events through print, radio, and public access television.
5. Coordination of updates to the project website to coincide with the multiple studies being undertaken.

**5. Advocacy and Legislative Coordination**

The Commission will continue to develop policy positions and advocate for improved transit to serve the Corridor and the Twin Cities region.

Commission activities include:

1. Informing legislators of the need for a transitway improvement in the Red Rock Corridor.
2. Advocating for increased transit funding to improve and expand the existing transit service in the Corridor.
3. Coordinating legislative initiatives with the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) and other transitway corridors.
4. Coordinating legislative initiatives with impacted freight railroads to speed the implementation of capacity improvements that benefit passenger and freight rail along the Red Rock and High-Speed Rail corridors.
5. Advocating for High-Speed rail funding at the state and federal level.
6. Establishing positions on legislative initiatives that affect the Red Rock Corridor.
7. Continuing to serve on the LOCATE Task Force for development of the St. Paul Union Depot as a multi-modal hub.

**6. Management, Policy and Administrative Activities**

Commission activities will include:

1. Prepare and adopt the 2010 Work Plan and Budget
2. Prepare the annual financial report
3. Prepare an annual legislative platform
4. Review insurance needs and procure appropriate insurance
5. Provide Commission and staff administration
6. Manage Commission expenses
7. Manage the consultant selected for each of the various work tasks undertaken by the commission
8. Attend regional/national conferences to educate members on transit alternatives and their impact on the built environment.

**2010 Operating Revenue**

| <b>Revenue Source</b>       | <b>Amount</b>    |
|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Fund Balance <sup>(1)</sup> | \$ 97,455        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                | <b>\$ 97,455</b> |

**2010 Operating Expenditures**

| <b>Expenditure Category</b>   | <b>Amount</b>    |
|---|------------------|
| Corridor Administration <sup>(2)</sup> /General Activities<br>- Corridor Insurance<br>- Corridor memberships<br>- Website fees<br>- Publishing/Printing/Advertising<br>- Meeting supplies<br>- Postage<br>- Consultant Services | \$ 30,000        |
| Advocacy<br>- Meeting supplies/Postage<br>- Publishing/Printing/Advertising<br>- Travel to Washington D.C.<br>- Travel to a National Transit Conference<br>- Meals/Lodging  | \$ 30,000        |
| Contingency   | \$ 10,000        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>\$ 70,000</b> |

Operating Budget Notes:

1. The current fund balance is sufficient to cover the Commission's budget. No funding contribution will be required for 2010.
2. The county regional railroad authorities are conducting administrative functions, including mailings. Such items are eligible for reimbursement as approved by the Commission.

**2010 Capital Revenue**

| <b>Revenue Source</b>            | <b>Amount</b>       |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Federal 5339 funds (2006 & 2007) | \$ 3,275,000        |
| RCRRA Local Match <sup>(1)</sup> | \$ 762,500          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                     | <b>\$ 4,037,500</b> |

Capital Budget Notes:

1. The Red Rock Corridor Commission passed a Resolution No. 2009-2 allocating \$1,000,000 in state bond funding for preliminary engineering work at the Union Depot. In return, the RCRRA agreed to provide the local match for the Station Area Planning Study, the East metro Railroad Capacity Analysis, the Economic Analysis of the Union Depot, Coordination of Corridors into Union Depot and an East Metro Travel Time Benefit study.

**2010 Capital Expenditures**

East Metro Railroad Capacity Analysis

This study would evaluate railroad capacity improvements needed to implement Amtrak, commuter rail, Midwest Regional Rail (high speed), and freight movements north and east of downtown St. Paul.

The study, which will begin in early 2010, will take up to 18 months to complete. The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority will be the contract manager for the study. The Red Rock Corridor Commission will be a project partner for this study and be involved in the decision-making process.

Revenue sources for this work are listed below:

| <b>Revenue Source</b>                | <b>Amount</b>       |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Federal Appropriations (2006 & 2007) | \$ 1,600,000        |
| RCRRA Local Match                    | \$ 400,000          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                         | <b>\$ 2,000,000</b> |

Economic Analysis of the Union Depot

Evaluate economic impacts of a renovated Depot on St. Paul, Ramsey County, the region, and the state. This would involve impacts in terms of land values, in perceived retail spending, in economic growth, in employment, and etc. Development potential would also be an important element.

The study which will begin in early 2010 will take up to 6 months to complete. The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority will be the contract manager for the study.

Revenue sources for this work are listed below:

| <b>Revenue Source</b>                | <b>Amount</b>     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Federal Appropriations (2006 & 2007) | \$ 170,000        |
| RCRRA Local Match                    | \$ 42,500         |
|                                      |                   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                         | <b>\$ 212,500</b> |

Future Studies

Future studies identified include a coordination of corridors into Union Depot and an East Metro Travel Time Benefit study. Start dates, formula contributions for the local match and contract managing agencies have not been determined. The scope and nature of these studies will need to be further examined.

| <b>Revenue Source</b>                  | <b>Amount</b>       |
|--|---------------------|
| Federal Appropriations (2006 & 2007)   | \$ 1,505,000        |
| RCRRA Local Match                      | \$ 320,000          |
| Remaining Local Match to be Determined | \$ 56,250           |
|  |                     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                           | <b>\$ 1,881,250</b> |



**DATE:** February 18, 2010  
**TO:** Red Rock Corridor Commission  
**FROM:** Staff  
**RE:** Citizens Advisory Committee – Reaffirm Appointments

The public involvement plan for the Station area and Site Master Planning study includes the formation of a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) to involve key stakeholders, citizens and business owners in the important decisions that are made in each community. Each of the Cities recommended for a station site in the Alternatives Analysis (St Paul, Newport, Cottage Grove, and Hastings) is appointing two representatives to the CAC; one from a business organization and one representing the "broader" community. The City's have appointed the following members to the CAC.

| City          | Representative        | Name             | Affiliation   |
|---------------|-----------------------|------------------|---|
| St Paul       | Business              | TBD              |   |
| St Paul       | Community             | Betsy Leach      | Community Organizer, District 1 Community Council                     |
| Newport       | Business              | Gregory Hanson   |   |
| Newport       | Community             | Mary Ann Newman  |   |
| Newport       | Community (Alternate) | Kim Brown        |   |
| Cottage Grove | Business              | Perry de Stefano | Attorney, Chamber of Commerce, and St. Paul resident                  |
| Cottage Grove | Community             | Richard Remackel | Cottage Grove Resident  |
| Hastings      | Business              | Ronald Toppin    | Commercial lender, active in Chamber of Commerce, Hastings EDA member |
| Hastings      | Community             | Lynn Moratzka    | Former Hastings Council Member and retired Dakota County Planner      |

At the January Corridor Commission meeting, the Commission appointed Sandi Dingle of St Paul Park Council to fill 1 of the 4 at-large positions on the CAC. 3 at-large positions are still open. Corridor Commission members should submit suggested names and contact information for the remaining at-large CAC members to the Corridor Commission staff.

**Action**

Reaffirm appointments of CAC Members, appoint additional at-large CAC members (if candidates are identified)

**LOCKRIDGE  
GRINDAL  
NAUEN**

P. L. L. P.

Attorneys at Law

[www.locklaw.com](http://www.locklaw.com)

MINNEAPOLIS  
Suite 2200  
100 Washington Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2179  
T 612.339.6900  
F 612-339-0981

WASHINGTON, D.C.  
Suite 210  
415 Second Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20002-4900  
T 202.544.9840  
F 202-544-9850

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Counties Transit Improvement Board  
**FR:** Dennis McGrann // Emily Gehrman  
**DT:** February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2010  
**RE:** Federal Update

Below you will find an update for the *Counties Transit Improvement Board* (CTIB) on federal transportation funding and policy initiatives in the second session of the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress.

**Congressional Schedule**

The House and Senate are not in session this week for the Presidents' Day recess. Due to the unprecedented amount of snow in the Washington region, the House suspended all votes during the week of February 8<sup>th</sup>, and the Senate had a very light legislative agenda. Both chambers are expected to return February 22<sup>nd</sup> and begin work on a full schedule of various legislative initiatives.

**FY 2011 Appropriations**

The Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations process has already begun. We have contacted all Congressional offices to determine their process and deadlines. The following is the information provided by the offices. We continue to work with staff to insure that all CTIB project priorities are submitted to the appropriate offices on time.

| <b>Member</b> | <b>Deadline</b>                          | <b>Forms</b>  |
|---------------|--|---------------|
| Ellison       | February 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 4 PM Central | Online        |
| McCollum      | March 1 <sup>st</sup> , 4 PM Central     | Online        |
| Paulsen       | February 19 <sup>th</sup>                | Word Document |
| Klobuchar     | February 19 <sup>th</sup>                | Word Document |
| Franken       | March 5 <sup>th</sup>                    | Online        |

**FY 2011 Transportation Budget Proposal**

President Obama is calling for a \$4 billion infrastructure fund for large-scale transportation projects, as well as an additional \$1 billion in his fiscal 2011 budget for high-speed and intercity passenger rail.

Obama's fiscal 2010 budget proposed a \$5 billion infrastructure bank, but appropriators rejected the idea in the absence of authorizing legislation. This year's budget again requests funding for a National Infrastructure Innovation and Finance Fund, which would comprise a blend of grants and loans for large-scale transportation projects that provide a "significant economic benefit" to the nation or a region. The following are highlights of the president's transportation funding requests:

- \$79.1 billion for the overall transportation budget (compared with \$78.4 billion in fiscal 2010).
- \$1 billion requested for high-speed and intercity passenger rail would build on the \$8 billion already enacted as part of the early 2009 stimulus law (PL 111-5).
- \$1.6 billion for Amtrak, roughly the same as enacted for fiscal 2010. For public transit, the administration is seeking \$2.2 billion, about \$221 million less than enacted for fiscal 2010.

The budget also continues the administration's call to delay enacting a new surface transportation bill into spring of next year. Senate transportation leaders have endorsed this approach, but the House has balked.

As a result of the standoff between chambers, highway and transit programs are currently operating on a short-term extension that will expire at the end of February (PL 111-118).

Obama's fiscal 2011 budget proposal recommends terminating the Surface Transportation Priorities and the Rail Line Relocation Grant programs. Under both programs, virtually all the funds are earmarked by individual lawmakers for specific projects. The administration contends that both programs duplicate other merit-based programs that distribute transportation funding.

For the current fiscal year, lawmakers distributed more than \$293 million to fund 353 projects through the Surface Transportation Priorities program. Congress funded 27 projects costing almost \$25 million through the Rail Line Relocation Grant program.

The difficulty Obama will apparently face in removing the programs from the budget should come as no surprise. Both were proposed for termination in the president's fiscal 2010 budget, but lawmakers provided funding.

### **Jobs Legislation Update**

Senate Finance Committee Leadership offered its version of a jobs bill package during the week of February 8<sup>th</sup>. Majority Leader Reid rejected the expansive plan and instead opted to for a more narrow approach. The four key provisions that Majority Leader Reid packaged together include:

- Extending federal highway and transit programs for a year, while temporarily refinancing the Highway Trust Fund.
- Social Security tax holiday for businesses that hire new employees with a bonus \$1,000 tax credit for each new employee they keep for at least a year (\$13 billion estimated cost over 10 years);
- Modifying and extending the Build America Bonds program (\$2 billion cost) for public works construction projects
- Extending the increased capital expenditure expensing rules for businesses

The Senate Finance Committee's larger package, whose provisions may be discussed at a later date, contains extensions for a number of tax policies that expired at the end of 2009.

### **Federal Transit Administration CEI Q&A**

Over the last several weeks there have been many questions regarding the FTA's rule change for the CEI. Below we have attached a full press release from the FTA with a list of questions and answers regarding the rule change for the "Cost Effectiveness Index."

**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:** [http://www.fta.dot.gov/about/about\\_FTA\\_11065.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/about/about_FTA_11065.html)

**Q: How will FTA now determine which projects to recommend in the annual President's budget for Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs) and Project Construction Grant Agreements (PCGAs)?**

A: The Administration will no longer target its funding recommendations only to projects that receive a Medium or better cost-effectiveness rating. Instead, FTA will rely on the statutory framework contained in Sections 5309(d) and (e) of Title 49, United States Code, as amended. Thus, in order to be eligible for a funding recommendation, a project must receive an overall rating of at least Medium and be expected to be ready for an FFGA or PCGA in the fiscal year for which the President's Budget is being developed. To receive an overall project rating of Medium or better, a project's justification and the local financial commitment ratings both must be Medium or better. Cost-effectiveness will continue to be evaluated as one of the six statutory project justification criteria.

## **Lockridge Grindal Nauen Federal Relations Group**

February 17, 2010

### **Q: Will FTA be changing how cost-effectiveness is calculated?**

A: In the near term, the New and Small Starts evaluation and rating process, including the calculation of cost-effectiveness, will remain as it is. However, FTA will soon put out a rulemaking for public comment that will propose ideas for better measuring and quantifying the benefits provided by transit projects including environmental, economic development, congestion relief, and other social benefits.

FTA will propose a revised cost-effectiveness calculation that more fully takes into account this wider range of benefits.

FTA encourages active participation by the transit industry on this rulemaking and looks forward to hearing input from our grantees and stakeholders.

### **Q: When will these changes take effect?**

A: The rescission of the budget decision principle requiring at least a Medium rating on cost-effectiveness for a funding recommendation takes effect immediately. Changes to the New and Small Starts evaluation and rating process will take effect upon completion of the rulemaking process.

### **Q: How will the rescission of the requirement for at least a Medium cost-effectiveness rating for a funding recommendation affect projects already in the New/Small Starts pipeline?**

A: Most of the projects currently in the New Starts pipeline have a cost-effectiveness rating of Medium or better. The few that do not could be affected favorably by this change, as long as an overall project rating of at least Medium is maintained. The change also benefits those projects close to the threshold between a Medium and Medium-low cost-effectiveness rating since projects in this situation in the past sometimes have had to select sub-optimal design options to remain at a Medium rating for cost-effectiveness.

### **Q: How does this affect FTA's New and Small Starts approval process for entry into preliminary engineering, final design, or project development?**

A: Previously, FTA did not prohibit new projects from entering into New Starts preliminary engineering or Small Starts project development if they had a cost-effectiveness rating less than Medium as long as the overall project rating was at least Medium. However, FTA did previously prohibit New Starts projects from moving into final design if they had a cost-effectiveness rating of less than Medium. With this new change, all projects will be allowed to advance through the various phases of project development as long as they receive a Medium or better overall rating and have met the other readiness requirements associated with advancement into that stage.

### **Q: How does this change affect National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approvals of New and Small Starts projects?**

A: Existing FTA New and Small Starts policy guidance related to NEPA approvals does not address the previous cost effectiveness policy specifically. Instead, it states that the environmental decision document for a New or Small Starts project with an overall project rating of less than Medium must

**Lockridge Grindal Nauen Federal Relations Group**

February 17, 2010

include a statement as to how the New or Small Starts process may affect the ability of the project to advance to implementation. This does not change.

**Q: Will this alter FTA's process for reviewing ridership estimations, calculation of transportation system user benefits, or comparison of the proposed project with a baseline alternative?**

A: In the near term, the evaluation and rating process will remain as is, including FTA's review of ridership estimations, calculation of user benefits, and comparison with a baseline alternative. Changes in one or more of these areas may occur as a result of regulatory changes.

**Q: Does this change affect the projects considered eligible for funding under the Urban Circulator notice of funding availability?**

A: This change does not affect the Urban Circulator program in any way. Because they will receive less than \$25 million in Section 5309 Major Capital Investment funds, Urban Circulator projects will be exempt from the evaluation criteria and rating process pursuant to Section 5309(e)(1)(B). As stated in the notice of funding availability, Urban Circulator projects will be evaluated solely on the livability criteria listed in the Federal Register notice. The Federal Register notice does not mention cost-effectiveness as a criterion.

As always, Lockridge Grindal Nauen will continue to monitor these and any other pertinent transportation issues. Please do not hesitate to contact Dennis McGrann at (202) 544-9840 or [dmmcgrann@locklaw.com](mailto:dmmcgrann@locklaw.com) or Emily Gehrman at (202) 544-9896 or [ejgehrman@locklaw.com](mailto:ejgehrman@locklaw.com) if you have any questions.

**Red Rock Corridor Commission  
Resolution 2010-01**

**Resolution supporting the request by the Minnesota High Speed Rail  
Commission of \$26 million in Federal Funds for environmental and  
engineering work for the Twin Cities to Chicago High Speed Rail  
Corridor**

**WHEREAS**, the Red Rock Corridor Commission was established in 1998 to address transportation needs in the Red Rock Corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, the Red Rock Corridor travels 30 miles from Hastings through the Union Depot in St. Paul and on to Minneapolis along the BNSF and CP mainlines; and

**WHEREAS**, the federally designated high speed rail corridor for Minnesota travels from the Twin Cities to La Crescent prior to crossing into Wisconsin; and

**WHEREAS**, high speed rail shares the Red Rock Corridor rail alignment from Hastings to St. Paul creating the opportunity for one investment to benefit multiple transportation options; and

**WHEREAS**, the Minnesota High Speed Rail Commission is working to establish high speed intercity passenger rail service between The Union Depot in St. Paul and Chicago along this federally designated route; and

**WHEREAS**, the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin have jointly contributed \$600,000 and have received \$600,000 in federal funds for the completion of Phase One Environmental Analysis and completion of an Alternatives Analysis for the Twin Cities to Madison portion of the Twin Cities to Chicago Corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, this analysis will be completed by September of 2010 and following the completion of this analysis the next step is to undertake detailed environmental and engineering work estimated to cost \$52 million; and

**WHEREAS**, state and federal funding will be sought in the amount of \$52 million, and

**WHEREAS**, there is current state funding for \$26 million for high speed rail of which \$16 million has been identified for the Twin Cities to Chicago Corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, the State of Wisconsin will need to partner with Minnesota to cover the remainder of the local cost; and

**WHEREAS**, federal funding is being requested to cover 50% of the detailed environmental and engineering work cost.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Red Rock Corridor Commission supports the request by the Minnesota High Speed Rail Commission for \$26 million to complete detailed environmental analysis and detailed engineering work on the Twin Cities to Chicago Corridor.

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_

Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_

Date Approved by Commission

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and correct copy of the Resolution presented to and adopted by the Red Rock Corridor Commission at a duly authorized meeting thereof held on the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 2010 as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

|            | YES   | NO    | ABSTAIN | ABSENT |
|------------|-------|-------|---------|--------|
| PETERSON   | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HARRIS     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| RETTMAN    | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| STENGLEIN  | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HOLLENBECK | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| KELLER     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| BAILEY     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HUNZIKER   | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HOPKINS    | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HELGEN     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| GORDON     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |

**Red Rock Corridor Commission  
Resolution 2010-02**

**Resolution supporting the request by the Ramsey County Regional  
Railroad Authority for Federal Funds for the Union Depot Multimodal  
Hub and Hoffman Interlocking/Yard Capacity Improvements**

**WHEREAS**, the Red Rock Corridor Commission was established in 1998 to address transportation needs in the Red Rock Corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, the Red Rock Corridor travels 30 miles from Hastings through the Union Depot in St. Paul and on to Minneapolis along the BNSF and CP mainlines; and

**WHEREAS**, to access the Union Depot Red Rock and High Speed trains will need to travel through Hoffman Interlocking/Yard, an identified freight bottleneck in the State Rail Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, increased capacity within and through Hoffman Interlocking/Yard provides a three for one benefit for high speed, commuter and freight rail which will improve the economic competitiveness of the state; and

**WHEREAS**, the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority will be submitting federal funding requests for The Union Depot Multimodal Hub for property acquisition, engineering, and construction and for Hoffman Interlocking/Yard for environmental and engineering work; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that Commission supports the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority's federal funding requests for The Union Depot Multi-modal Hub and for Hoffman Interlocking/Yard.

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_   
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_   
Date Approved by Commission

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and correct copy of the Resolution presented to and adopted by the Red Rock Corridor Commission at a duly authorized meeting thereof held on the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2010 as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

|            | YES   | NO    | ABSTAIN | ABSENT |
|------------|-------|-------|---------|--------|
| PETERSON   | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HARRIS     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| RETTMAN    | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| STENGLEIN  | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HOLLENBECK | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| KELLER     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| BAILEY     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HUNZIKER   | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HOPKINS    | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HELGEN     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| GORDON     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |

**Red Rock Corridor Commission  
Resolution 2010-03**

**Resolution supporting the request by the Washington County  
Regional Railroad Authority for \$4 Million for a 3 year demonstration  
commuter bus service and the design and construction of park-and-  
ride facilities along the Red Rock Corridor**

**WHEREAS**, the Red Rock Corridor Commission was established in 1998 to address transportation needs in the Red Rock Corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, the Red Rock Corridor Commission completed an Alternatives Analysis in 2007 that identified commuter rail as the long-term transit investment for the corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, expanding bus service, increasing bus frequency and providing additional park-and-ride facilities are the adopted strategies towards building transit ridership in the corridor prior to the construction of commuter rail; and

**WHEREAS**, the Commuter Bus Feasibility Study completed by the Red Rock Corridor Commission in 2009 outlines a preferred service development plan that is both cost-effective and generates a high level of ridership; and

**WHEREAS**, the preferred service plan is a 3 year demonstration commuter bus service originating in Hastings and traveling to and from both downtown St Paul and Minneapolis and the design and construction of additional park-and-ride-facilities along the corridor; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Commission supports Washington County Regional Railroad Authority's federal funding requests for \$4 million for a 3 year demonstration commuter bus service and the design and construction of park-and-ride facilities along the Red Rock Corridor.

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved by Commission

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution is a true and correct copy of the Resolution presented to and adopted by the Red Rock Corridor Commission at a duly authorized meeting thereof held on the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2010 as shown by the minutes of said meeting in my possession.

|            | YES   | NO    | ABSTAIN | ABSENT |
|------------|-------|-------|---------|--------|
| PETERSON   | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HARRIS     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| RETTMAN    | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| STENGLEIN  | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HOLLENBECK | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| KELLER     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| BAILEY     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HUNZIKER   | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HOPKINS    | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| HELGEN     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |
| GORDON     | _____ | _____ | _____   | _____  |



Minnesota Department of Transportation

Metropolitan District

Waters Edge  
1500 West County Road B-2  
Roseville, MN 55113-3174

January 29, 2010

Chapter 152 Stakeholder Group

**Re: Solicitation for Chapter 152 Transit Funding**

Dear Stakeholder:

As many of you know, in 2008 the Minnesota Legislature provided for \$50 Million in trunk highway bonds for transit improvements. The goal of the program is to provide highway transit advantage capital improvements that will support and encourage transit use in congested Trunk Highway corridors. Last year MnDOT worked with the Metropolitan Council, many transit providers and other agencies to develop a framework and criteria to help evaluate transit improvements for this purpose. The attachment contains criteria that will be used to select projects. This document outlines the eligibility and prioritizing criteria for projects.

Currently \$20 Million in Trunk Highway bonds are available through this solicitation with a \$6 Million cap per project. Please note that MnDOT may choose to select only a portion of the funds for projects during this cycle, and may reserve some funds for future transit improvement needs. Applications are due by March 31. During April and May a scoring committee of MnDOT and external partners will evaluate all applications and make recommendations to MnDOT's staff in June. Subsequently, MnDOT will make project selection and notify all proposers.

Please be sure to submit all of the requested "Project Information"; failure to do so could result in your project not scoring as well or not being considered for funding. In your project application information, please respond to all Qualifying Criteria and all eight Prioritizing Criteria. Additional forms and documents can be found under "Chapter 152 Solicitation" at:

<http://www.dot.state.mn.us/metro/teamtransit/>

If you have questions please contact Carl Jensen at (651) 234-7711 or [carl.jensen@state.mn.us](mailto:carl.jensen@state.mn.us).

Please send 10 paper copies and 2 CD's of your project applications to Carl Jensen at the address above. Again, please note, the deadline for all project applications to be submitted is **Wednesday, March 31<sup>st</sup>**. Applications received after this date cannot be considered for funding.

We look forward to working with you on these transit projects to build infrastructure that strengthens a multi-modal approach to transportation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott L. McBride".

Scott L. McBride, P.E.  
Metro District Engineer



Minnesota Department of Transportation  
 395 John Ireland Boulevard      Metropolitan District  
 Saint Paul, MN 55155            1500 West County Road B2  
    Roseville MN, 55113

## **Trunk Highway Transit Facility Improvements Chapter 152**

### **Solicitation Program**

#### Introduction

Contained in this document are the requirements and guidance for applying for state funds for trunk highway transit facility improvements as provided for in MN Laws, Chapter 152, Article 2, Sec. 3, subd.2.(d). The specific language in the law states, “Of the total appropriation under this subdivision, the commissioner shall use at least \$50 Million for accelerating transit facility improvement on or adjacent to trunk highways.”

The goal of the program is to provide highway transit advantage capital improvements that will support and encourage transit use in congested trunk highway corridors.

The total dollars currently available from Chapter 152 under this solicitation is \$20 Million. (Two projects have been identified for early implementation; the extension of the I-35W High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane northbound from the I-35W/E split to Burnsville Parkway and the I-94 Managed Corridor transit components, John Ireland Blvd to downtown Minneapolis. Each project was awarded \$15 Million for a total of \$30 million.). A maximum award to any one project from this solicitation will be capped at \$6 Million. Project authors are encouraged to leverage money from other sources to assist in delivering the project if project limit exceeds state funding cap. Project delivery costs are not eligible for these funds.

The solicitation process uses a set of qualifying criteria to determine if a proposed project is eligible for funding. In addition, there is a second set of prioritizing criteria which will be used to prioritize all projects for funding as well as determine the amount of funding. Projects funded under this program must use the awarded funds between state fiscal years 2011 and 2018, with priority on projects that can be awarded early.

There is an expectation that the submitted project will be delivered within the identified budget amount. If there is a significant scope change (i.e. reduction in the number of stalls or miles of bus shoulder) the project will be re-evaluated for eligibility for continued funding.

Completed application packages should contain 2 CD’s and 10 paper copies, 11 x 17 paper or smaller. Please send completed application package to:

Carl Jensen P.E., Mn/DOT  
 1500 West County Road B2  
 Roseville, Minnesota, 55113.





## Minnesota Department of Transportation

395 John Ireland Boulevard  
Saint Paul, MN 55155

Metropolitan District  
1500 West County Road B2  
Roseville MN, 55113

Applications must be postmarked on or before March 31, 2010

### Qualifying Criteria

- The project must be on or adjacent to the trunk highway (TH) right-of-way and be for a TH purpose, provide details like service predominantly on TH or relieves congestion primarily on the TH (see “Minnesota Management and Budget Guidance Relating to Permitted Uses of State Highway Bond Proceeds”).
- Funds are available to all Local Governmental Units (LGU) including Minnesota State agencies, the Metropolitan Council, joint powers boards, Indian Tribal governments, counties, cities and towns within the State of Minnesota. Proposals from other local nonprofit agencies or parties and special governmental agencies are eligible but must have a LGU sponsor as defined above. The LGU sponsor is the lead agency of record. The LGU/Lead Agency is responsible for making arrangements with the project sponsor to ensure all project requirements of the LGU and program are met.
- Eligible project types include: park-and-ride lots and facilities, park-and-pool lots and facilities, bus-only shoulders, HOV/HOT lanes, dedicated bus lanes, queue-jumping, ramp-meter bypasses, direct ramp access to park-and-ride facilities, pull-outs to accommodate bus stops on mainline, online transit stations, priced dynamic shoulders, and other projects designed to provide transit facilities improvements.
- The project must have a service life of at least 20 years.
- All projects must comply with the requirements of the American with Disabilities Act.
- Projects should be submitted in 2010 dollars and Mn/DOT will apply an inflation factor; **including inflation, the total project cap is \$6 Million.**
- Ineligible costs include:
  - Project costs incurred before construction
  - Operating costs for transit service and maintenance costs
  - Studies
  - Project delivery costs (pre-design, design, construction administration and post construction for example)
- The project must be consistent with the Metropolitan Council’s Transportation Policy Plan and/or Mn/DOT’s State Transportation Plan.
- The project must be consistent with adopted Regional Plans, County or City Comprehensive Plans. Submit letters from affected jurisdictions supporting the project.
- With the maximum contribution capped from Chapter 152 funding, the remaining portions of the project must be fully funded with matching funds from other sources.





## Minnesota Department of Transportation

395 John Ireland Boulevard  
Saint Paul, MN 55155

Metropolitan District  
1500 West County Road B2  
Roseville MN, 55113

- Right-of-Way must be publically owned at project completion. Based on guidance from Minnesota Management and Budget, most if not all cases this will mean ownership by MnDOT unless determined otherwise by the Bond Counsel.
- If the project is a park and ride, it must be included in Metropolitan Council *Draft 2030 Park-and-Ride Plan* or be a corridor study station location. Projects outside the Metro can use the corridor priority evaluation in the Metropolitan Council *Draft 2030 Park-and-Ride Plan*.
- Letters of support indicating public agency backing of the project are required with all affected communities, Metro Transit or other applicable transit agencies, and other units of government including MnDOT. The letters also need to confirm local funding commitments if applicable.
- Operations costs and funding; identify approximate cost and funding source (assumptions reviewed for reasonableness) and responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the improvement.

Please note that projects must meet all of the qualifying criteria to be considered. Only projects meeting all of the qualifying criteria will be reviewed and scored.

### Project Prioritizing Criteria

1. 150 Points for Hourly Person Throughput Improvement using Hourly Person Throughput Improvement Spreadsheet.
2. 150 Points for Corridor priority from the Metropolitan Council *Draft 2030 Park-and-Ride Plan* or corridor priority evaluation in the Metropolitan Council *Draft 2030 Park-and-Ride Plan*.
3. 150 Points for Congestion level; based on extent and hours of congestion per day along the most congested segment. Mn/DOT defines congestion as traffic flowing at speeds less than or equal to 45 miles per hour (M.P.H.) on the freeway system and controlled access arterials.
4. 150 Points for Benefit Comparison Analysis, (total project cost / total rush hour person-throughput)
5. 100 Points for Connectivity with existing projects. Projects that extend, connect to, or fill in gaps in a current transit system will rank higher for this criterion.
6. 100 Points for Early completion of projects. Projects that can be completed early will rank higher for this criterion.
7. 100 Points for Operating Cost Efficiencies – Projects that reduce operating costs will rank higher for this criterion than those projects that will increase operating costs.
8. 100 Points for Partnership in funding. Projects that include funding from other sources will rank higher for this criterion.

### Schedule

- Project solicitation sent out – Week of January 25, 2010
- Eight weeks to prepare solicitations and obtain concurrence from Mn/DOT.





## Minnesota Department of Transportation

395 John Ireland Boulevard  
Saint Paul, MN 55155

Metropolitan District  
1500 West County Road B2  
Roseville MN, 55113

- Project submittals due back to Mn/DOT – by March 31, 2010
- Mn/DOT, with assistance from an external scoring group, will evaluate the applications and prepare a ranked list of projects – April/May 2010.
- Project ranked list will be presented to Mn/DOT's Transportation Program Investment Committee (TPIC) for approval – June 2010.
- Project selection announced by MnDOT – July 2010.
- Final project letting date not to exceed – state fiscal year 2018.

