



## Midtown Corridor AA

### TAC Meeting

January 16, 2014, 2:30 PM – 4:30 PM

Metro Transit- Heywood Chambers

#### TAC and PMT Members in Attendance

Name	Organization	Present	Alternate	Absent
Dean Michalko	Hennepin County - HCWT	X		
Tom Johnson	Hennepin County - Transportation			X
Lisa Johnson	Metro Transit - Bus Ops		X	
Maurice Roers	Metro Transit - Eng/Fac	X		
Brian Funk	Metro Transit - Rail Ops	X		
John Dillery	Metro Transit - Serv Dev			X
Michael Mechtenberg	Metro Transit - Serv Dev	X		
Jim Alexander	Metro Transit - SWLRT	X		
Katie White	Metropolitan Council			X
Gina Mitteco	MnDOT	X		
Paul Mogush	Minneapolis CPED	X		
Don Pflaum	Minneapolis Public Works	X		
Simon Blenski	Minneapolis Public Works	X		
Charles Carlson	Metro Transit - BRT	X		

#### OTHER ATTENDEES

Name	Organization
Faith Cable-Kumon	MCWP
Jill Hentges	Metro Transit

#### Consultant team in attendance

Name	Organization
Joe Kern	SRF
Mona Elabbady	SRF
Liz Heyman	SRF



## Meeting Agenda

### **1. Introductions/Administrative Details**

- The upcoming PAC/TAC meeting on February 12, 2014 will now be held at the Colin Powell Center.

### **2. Outreach efforts and survey results**

- Mona gave an update on the November open house and the online survey
- Mike noted that there is more enthusiasm from stakeholders regarding the project than we can probably meet. Stakeholders are very interested in getting something built
- A TAC member asked if the negative feedback that applies to the enhanced bus and rail in the Greenway alternatives still applies to the dual. The TAC member noted that it might be worth acknowledging that the dual alternative still has these negatives.

### **3. Other updates since last meeting**

- Economic Development Analysis
  - The economic development numbers are in but the project team is still working on adjusting the numbers.
  - A TAC member asked if the method consistent with other economic impact studies in the area.
    - The method is not the same as what was used for SWLRT, because SWLRT has a much larger scope than this alternative analysis
    - The project team researched both local and national methodologies for measuring economic development at a high level. There is definitely not a consensus or an 'approved' method in the industry for measuring economic development potential.
  - A TAC member asked if the analysis takes into the account that not all the parcels will actually develop
    - The methodology addresses this issue by only assuming vacant parcels would redevelop. In reality, there are many parcels in the corridor with relatively low value buildings that could be torn down and redeveloped.
  - A TAC member asked if the project team looked at the current research the Met Council is doing on property values surrounding Hiawatha.
    - The project team looked at the parcels that have developed in that area and there was no discernable pattern to rely on to predict how much value would be gained.
- SWLRT



- Jim Alexander noted that SWLRT staff has concluded that Midtown can have a direct connection to SWLRT in both the colocation and relocation scenarios.

#### 4. Locally preferred alternative resolution language and vote

- Only the PAC members will be voting to endorse the LPA at the February 12 meeting. The TAC and CAC members will not be voting.
- There are three main issues that are *not* included in the LPA vote:
  - The project team is *not* asking the PAC to vote on the sections of double versus single track.
    - The change in single versus double between the two scenarios is about a mile, ranging from 25% to 40% of the total length of track. This percentage exceeds the footage of single track proposed in the Graebner study.
    - The project teams believe that some single track will work for this project, because it is relatively small, has relatively few stations and is more of a closed system than other local rail systems in the area (i.e. Hiawatha, SWLRT and Central).
  - The project team is *not* asking the PAC to vote on the project's vehicle type (i.e. a light rail vehicle (LRV) versus a streetcar vehicle)
    - A TAC member asked that the project team change the word 'operational' to 'functional' in the LPA resolution, because the vehicle type would create small operational differences, but not functional differences.
    - A TAC member noted that Siemens produces a streetcar vehicle with the same inner working as a LRV.
    - A TAC member encouraged the project team to think about a communications plan to discuss the differences (or lack thereof) between streetcar and LRV.
  - The project team is *not* asking the PAC to vote on turf versus ballast track
    - A TAC member noted that work rules make it difficult for agencies to have partnerships with other groups to maintain green space in the greenway.
    - A TAC member noted that the project team should encourage the public to think more about greening other pieces in the Greenway. For example, the project should address how to place greenery along the retaining walls.
    - A TAC member noted that it would be helpful to develop criteria to assess where turf track might be most valuable (e.g. at stations).
  - A TAC member asked if there has been any discussion around how turf would be maintained.
    - No, this issue is not within the scope of the current study.
- An LPA is required for a project to be included in the Met Council's Transportation Policy Plan (TPP)
  - A TAC member asked that will the fact that the Midtown corridor is already in the existing TPP as an arterial BRT corridor affect how the LPA from this study is included in the updated TPP. Does the PAC only need to vote the rail portion in the TPP?



- Mike is working with Met Council MTS staff on this issue, because having a dual alternative has not happened before. Since they are updating the TPP it potentially won't be an issue.
- A TAC member noted that usually the next step in this process would be to get the LPA endorsed by City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County and the Metropolitan Council. The member asked if this process would have to be completed by the time the Met Council votes on the TPP.
  - Mike noted that it is unclear right now what form local support needs to take (and when it needs to happen by) since the entire TPP is being updated
- Comments on the LPA language:
  - A TAC member asked for the following edit: In last whereas: 'has provided input IN the resolution' not SUPPORTING the resolution.
    - Mike mentioned the wording in that section had already been tweaked and a similar edit was made.
  - Metro transit staff thinks it makes sense to build the enhanced bus first while continuing to study the rail option (most likely with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)).
    - A TAC member to highlight this in the resolution. This will highlight that the region is currently in a fiscally constrained scenario.
  - A TAC member asked when the language will be sent to the PAC
    - Mike is going to have as many one-on-one conversations with PAC as possible to discuss the resolution.
    - The language will be sent out within the next week or two.
  - Mike asked the TAC to send any other edits/input on the resolution language to him in the next few weeks.

## 5. Next Steps

- A TAC member noted that the FTA process sets expiration dates on some work. This is important to remember as TAC members discuss the project with policymakers.
- A TAC member thanked the project team for their hard work on the project. He thought the process has gone very well.