Corridor Management Committee

Meeting #1 | April 29, 2022
Today’s Topics

• Welcome & Introductions
• Corridor Management Committee Roles & Responsibilities
• Project Overview
• White Bear Lake City Council Resolution
• A Roadmap to Responding to the City’s Resolution
• Corridor Management Committee Discussion of Potential Paths Forward
• Next Steps
Welcome and Introductions

Charlie Zelle | CMC Chair
Victoria Reinhardt | CMC Vice Chair
Building the Regional Transit Network

- Transitway corridors are the spine of the regional transit system
- Purple Line would be the 8th regional project to be federally funded through FTA’s discretionary, rigorous and competitive Capital Investment Grant Program
Long History of Planning for Purple Line

• Corridor Planning & Conceptual Engineering Phase (1998 – 2017)
    • Rush Line Transit Study (2001); Rush Line Corridor Alternatives Analysis (2009)
  – Pre-Project Development Study (2014-2017)
    • 55 potential route segments and 7 bus/rail transit modes evaluated

• Environmental Analysis Phase (2018 – 2021)
  – Five Municipal Resolutions of Support the Preliminary Design (15%) Plans (2020)
  – Environmental Assessment (2021) and Findings of No Significant Impact (2021)
Public Engagement All Along the Way

• Between 2014-2017, more than 5,000 people participated during the process leading to the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative

• 197 meeting/events in all corridor communities (2018-2021)
  – Pop-up events, open houses, virtual meetings, one-on-one stakeholder meetings, Community Advisory Committee meetings, etc.
  – Engaged with more than 3,400 people
CMC Role & Responsibilities

Charlie Zelle | CMC Chair
Project Committee Approach

- Station Area Planning (SAP)
- City Approved Plans
- Metropolitan Council Review

- Design Advancement and Refinement Teams (DARTS)
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- Community and Business Advisory Committee (CBAC)
- Corridor Management Committee (CMC)
- Ramsey County
- Metropolitan Council

Information Sharing and Collaboration Opportunities
Corridor Management Committee Charter

• Advisory to Met Council and Ramsey County
  – Votes may be taken but are not binding on the Council or County

• Elected and appointed officials representing their governmental entity’s diverse perspectives (not individual or personal perspectives)

• Attend meetings regularly, actively listen, participate in discussion, respect other viewpoints

• Regular meetings scheduled monthly and canceled as needed. A minimum of quarterly meetings anticipated in 2022 and 2023
Project Overview

Frank Alarcon | Deputy Project Manager
Purple Line BRT Overview

• Serving the Northeast Metro:
  – Ramsey County, 6 municipalities
  – 51% BIPOC, 20% low-income, 12% zero car households

• 15 mile long route with 11 dedicated guideway miles

• 21 stations with 3 park-and-rides

• 17 electric bus fleet

• 6,900 Est. Daily Riders (2040)
Purpose and Need

• Guided the selection of the Locally Preferred Alternative in 2017 and foundational to the environmental review in 2020

• Purpose
  – To provide transit service that satisfies the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public and supports sustainable development within the corridor area.

• Needs
  – Serving the needs of people who rely on transit.
  – Meeting increasing demand for reliable, high-frequency transit.
  – Planning for sustainable growth and development.
  – Expanding multimodal travel options.
Cost Estimate & Funding Approach

• Cost estimate in the Environmental Assessment
  – Design 15% complete
  – $475 million

• Cost estimate at entry into Project Development
  – Design 25% complete
  – $445 million

• Project Development Phase budget: $39.9 M
  – Ramsey County Regional Rail Auth: $3.99M (10%)
  – Ramsey County: $35.91M (90%)
# Overall Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS</th>
<th>PROJECT DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ENGINEERING</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION</th>
<th>REVENUE SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 to 2021</td>
<td>December 2021 to March 2023</td>
<td>April 2023 to October 2023</td>
<td>November 2023 to August 2026</td>
<td>Begin Fall/Winter 2026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

- ONGOING EVALUATION, MONITORING, AND MITIGATION

**15% DESIGN**

- DESIGN & ENGINEERING ADVANCEMENT
  - 30% July 2022
  - 60% Dec 2022
  - 90% June 2023
  - 100% Oct 2023

**CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS (CIG) PROGRAM**

- PD Entry Dec 2021
- Project Rating Spring 2023
- Entry Into Engineering Summer 2023
- Receive FFGA June 2024

**ONGOING PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT**

**ONGOING EVALUATION, MONITORING, AND MITIGATION**

**BIDDING**

- July 2022

**CONSTRUCTION**

- 30% Dec 2022
- 60% June 2023
- 90% Oct 2023

**REVENUE SERVICE**

- Begin Fall/Winter 2026

---

**Timeline**

- April 2022
- Summer 2023
- PD Entry
- Engineering Entry
- Receive FFGA
- Summer 2023
- Bidding
- Engineering
- Construction
- Revenue Service
White Bear Lake City Council Resolution

Bill Walsh | White Bear Lake City Councilmember
White Bear Lake City Council Actions

• Prior City Council voted 3-2 in support of project requests
  – Resolution of Support (Locally Preferred Alternative) on July 25, 2017
  – Resolution of Support (Downtown Station Relocation) on February 26, 2019
  – Resolution of Support (Preliminary Design Plans) on April 14, 2020
  – 2040 Comprehensive Plan Adoption (with Purple Line) on June 8, 2021 (5-0 vote)
  – Resolution of Municipal Consent (Highway Access Change) on October 12, 2021

• November 2021 Elections: New Mayor and City Councilmember

• Resolution of Opposition: 3-2 vote on March 8, 2022

  “The City Council requests that the Met Council modify the BRT Route so that it does not enter the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of White Bear Lake and to take such other actions as may be needed to accomplish the requested alteration of the BRT Route.”
A Roadmap to Responding to the City’s Resolution

Craig Lamothe | Project Manager
Roadmap Overview

• Met Council and Ramsey County received City of White Bear Lake’s resolution and heard their concerns about the BRT project

• In light of the resolution and in response to those concerns, the Council and County have developed potential BRT route modifications

• At this meeting, the Council and County are seeking a broader discussion among project partners about the potential paths forward

• A recommendation on whether to proceed with modifying the BRT route would come at a future meeting
Acknowledging White Bear Lake’s Feedback

• Concern over the number of weekday BRT bus trips per day (89)
• Concern over the size of BRT buses (60 ft articulated vehicles)
• Concerns over the disruption of station and dedicated lane infrastructure on existing roadways and adjacent businesses
  – Conversion of two-way street segments to one way, removal of on-street parking, modification of business accesses
Potential BRT Route Modifications

• Truncate the BRT line somewhere along County Road E between Highway 61 and Interstate 35E, and add a “Purple Line Connector” between Maplewood Mall and downtown White Bear Lake

OR

• Truncate the BRT line at Maplewood Mall Transit Center, and add a “Purple Line Connector” between Maplewood Mall and downtown White Bear Lake
Why Purple Line Connector?

• Why connecting bus service instead of BRT?
  – Responsive to the City of White Bear Lake’s concerns about number of trips, size of vehicles, loss of parking, changes to business access, etc.
  – Still connects the northeast metro area to the METRO system
  – Remains consistent with the Project’s purpose and need
  – An incremental improvement to expanding access to opportunities for people and businesses desiring expanded mobility options
What is Purple Line Connector?

• A regular route bus connection between Maplewood Mall Transit Center and downtown White Bear Lake
  – Service: 30-minute frequency during same span as Purple Line
  – Bus: size TBD (40’ or shorter); electric propulsion (proposed)
  – Minimal infrastructure: bus stop sign with possible shelter
    • No station platforms or Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes
    • No real time signs, off board fare collection, heat, safety/security features at stops
    • No reconstruction of Highway 61 near Whitaker Street
    • No associated Bruce Vento Regional Trail extension improvements
    • No sidewalk improvements for better access to stops
## LPA vs. Route Modifications: Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>BRT ROUTE MODIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Risks</td>
<td>• Lack of cooperation from a project partner during design and construction phases</td>
<td>• Uncertainty associated with re-opening locally preferred alternative process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uncertain ability to acquire necessary public property and public right-of-way rights from</td>
<td>• Uncertainty associated with re-opening environmental process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an unwilling project partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uncertain ability to secure any necessary approvals and permits from an unwilling project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential lack of a willing project partner to accept transfer of ownership / maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities for new non-transit infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LPA vs. Route Modifications: Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSIDERATION</th>
<th>LOCALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE</th>
<th>BRT ROUTE MODIFICATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Delay</td>
<td>• Uncertain delay stemming from actions of an unwilling project partner&lt;br&gt;• Months to years; Likely to occur later in the process</td>
<td>• Trickle down delay stemming from re-opening environmental process&lt;br&gt;• Likely less than 1 year; Occurs up front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Increase</td>
<td>• Inflationary increase stemming from unknown schedule delay&lt;br&gt;• Increase associated with acquiring public property and public right-of-way rights from unwilling project partner</td>
<td>• Overall cost lower due to shorter BRT project&lt;br&gt;• Inflationary increase stemming from known schedule delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funding Eligibility</td>
<td>• Either option produces a federally viable project with a Medium project justification rating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative Overview

• Locally Preferred Alternative

• Alternative 1: CR E / Vadnais Heights Area

• Alternative 2: Maplewood Mall / Maplewood Area
Alternative 1: End in Vadnais Heights

- CR E Corridor
- TH 61 Corridor
- City Center
  - Vadnais Square
  - CR E at I-35E park-and-ride
- Willow Lake Blvd.
  - business park
  - H.B. Fuller
Alternative 1A: End on Hwy 61 at CR E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length*</td>
<td>3.1 miles shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations*</td>
<td>3 fewer stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership*</td>
<td>350 to 450 fewer riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Estimate*</td>
<td>$45M to $55M lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Locations Served</td>
<td>TCO Sports Garden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change from Baseline

Elements to Consider:

• Keep or eliminate Buerkle Road Station, which is located in White Bear Lake but intended to serve greater Buerkle Road business district
Alternative 1B: End on I-35E at CR E via CR E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length*</td>
<td>1.6 miles shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations*</td>
<td>1 to 2 fewer stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership*</td>
<td>150 to 350 fewer riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Estimate*</td>
<td>$15M to $35M lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Locations Served</td>
<td>CR E / Labore Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Center 35E Park-and-Ride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change from Baseline

**Elements to Consider:**

- Keep or eliminate Buerkle Road Station, which is located in White Bear Lake but intended to serve greater Buerkle Road business district
- 1–2 new station locations along Co Rd E
Alternative 1C: End on I-35E at CR E via Willow Lake Blvd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length*</td>
<td>1.7 miles shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations*</td>
<td>1 to 2 fewer stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership*</td>
<td>150 to 350 fewer riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Estimate*</td>
<td>$15M to $35M lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Locations Served</td>
<td>H.B. Fuller/SEH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Center/35E Park-and-Ride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change from Baseline

Elements to Consider:

• Keep or eliminate Buerkle Road Station, which is located in White Bear Lake but intended to serve greater Buerkle Road business district

• 1-2 new station locations along Willow Lake Boulevard/Co Rd E
Alternative 1 Purple Line Connector via White Bear Ave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length</td>
<td>4.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Stops</td>
<td>6 stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Run Time</td>
<td>~ 35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>400 – 600 riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Locations Served</td>
<td>Maplewood Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Bear Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whitaker Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown White Bear Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative 2: End at Maplewood Mall Transit Center

- Maplewood Mall
- St. John’s Hospital
- Ramsey County Library
- Maplewood Mall Transit Center
- Birch Run Station Redevelopment
Alternative 2: End at Maplewood Mall via Beam Ave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length*</td>
<td>5.7 miles shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations*</td>
<td>5 fewer stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership*</td>
<td>700 to 1100 fewer riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Estimate*</td>
<td>$80M to $100M lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Locations Served</td>
<td>Maplewood Mall, St. John’s Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change from Baseline

**Elements to Consider:**

- Location of the St. John’s Boulevard Station
- Routing between St. John’s Boulevard Station and Maplewood Mall Transit Center Station
Alternative 2 Purple Line Connector via Buerkle Rd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length</td>
<td>5.7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Stops</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Run Time</td>
<td>~ 35 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>400 – 600 riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Locations Served</td>
<td>Maplewood Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buerkle Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TCO Sports Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Downtown White Bear Lake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Alternative Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METRIC</th>
<th>Locally Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Alt. 1A (End at Hwy 61/CR E)</th>
<th>Alt. 1B (Via CR E to 35E)</th>
<th>Alt. 1C (Via Willow Lake Blvd to 35E)</th>
<th>Alt. 2 (End at Maplewood Mall Transit Center)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route Length*</td>
<td>15.2 miles</td>
<td>3.1 mi. shorter</td>
<td>1.6 mi. shorter</td>
<td>1.7 mi. shorter</td>
<td>5.7 mi. shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Stations*</td>
<td>21 stations</td>
<td>3 fewer stations</td>
<td>1 to 2 fewer stations</td>
<td>5 fewer stations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Ridership with Connector*</td>
<td>6,900 riders</td>
<td>0 to 100 fewer riders</td>
<td>0 to 200 more riders</td>
<td>0 to 200 more riders</td>
<td>200 to 600 fewer riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Cost Estimate*</td>
<td>$445M</td>
<td>$45M to $55M lower</td>
<td>$15M to $35M lower</td>
<td>$80M to $100M lower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Change from Baseline
CMC Discussion of Potential Paths Forward

Charlie Zelle | CMC Chair
Victoria Reinhardt | CMC Vice Chair
Potential Outcomes

1) Revise the locally preferred alternative to reflect a new northern terminus station location along with BRT routing adjustments and a Purple Line Connector to White Bear Lake
   – CMC Recommendation to Met Council and Ramsey County
   – Corridor Partners pass Resolutions of Support for Revised LPA
   – Met Council amends Revised LPA into the Transportation Policy Plan

OR

2) Validate the current local preferred alternative and preliminary design plans
   – CMC Recommendation to Met Council and Ramsey County
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT COMMITTEE</th>
<th>DATE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Team</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management Team</td>
<td>3/16, 4/15, May, June, July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>3/24, 4/22, May, June, July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Business Advisory Committee</td>
<td>June, July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Management Committee</td>
<td>4/29, June, July, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council</td>
<td>June, August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsey County / Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority</td>
<td>June, August</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- During the June CMC meeting, will likely be seeking direction on the potential outcome to focus on
Next Steps

Craig Lamothe | Project Manager
## CMC Look Ahead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>MEETING PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June    | • Receive summary of stakeholder engagement of alternatives  
• Receive refinement of technical evaluation of alternatives  
• Provide feedback and direction to project staff  
• Consider a recommendation to Met Council and Ramsey County for suspending the LPA advancement in favor of further exploration of BRT Route modifications |
| July    | • Welcome new CMC members: Community & Business Advisory Committee (CBAC) co-chairs  
• Receive report on the CBAC’s first meeting (June)  
• Receive summary of broader public engagement of alternatives  
• Receive additional refinement of technical evaluation of alternatives  
• Provide feedback and direction to project staff |
| August  | • Consider a recommendation to Met Council and Ramsey County for a revised LPA |
| September | • Review of 30% Design including substantial changes from 15% Design  
• Preview of Advancing Design to 60% |
Future Meeting Format and Standing Time

- Recommendation: 100% Virtual

- Recommendation: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Week of the Month
  - Next meeting: Week of June 13
  - Subsequent meetings: Weeks of July 11, August 8, and September 12
For more information:
www.metrotransit.org/purple-line-project

Facebook and twitter @PurpleLineBRT

Craig Lamothe
Project Manager
(651) 602-1978
craig.lamothe@metrotransit.org

Frank Alarcon
Deputy Project Manager
(651) 602-1979
frank.alarcon@metrotransit.org
Thank You!

Purple Line Project Office

PurpleLine@metrotransit.org

651-602-1955