

T Transportation Committee

Meeting date: September 28, 2009

Metropolitan Council Meeting date: October 14, 2009

ADVISORY INFORMATION	
Date:	September 23, 2009
Subject:	CTIB 2010 Project Grant Applications Consistency with the 2030 TPP
District(s), Member(s):	All
Policy/Legal Reference:	M.S. 297A.992; Regional Transportation Policy Plan
Staff Prepared/Presented:	Arlene McCarthy, Director 651-602-1754 Amy Vennewitz, Deputy Director 651-602-1058 Mary Karlsson, Senior Planner 651-602-1819
Division/Department:	Metropolitan Transportation Services

Proposed Action

That the Metropolitan Council finds the nine project grant applications (summarized in the Attachment) submitted to the Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) for CY 2010 funding to be consistent with the Council's 2030 Transportation Policy Plan adopted January 2009.

Background

The 2008 state legislation which authorized the quarter cent sales tax for transitways capital and operating purposes specified the following:

A grant award for a transit project located within the metropolitan area, as defined in section 473.121, subdivision 2, may be funded only after the Metropolitan Council reviews the project for consistency with the transit portion of the Metropolitan Council policy plan and one of the following occurs:

- (1) the Metropolitan Council finds the project to be consistent;
- (2) the Metropolitan Council initially finds the project to be inconsistent, but after a good faith effort to resolve the inconsistency through negotiations with the joint powers board, agrees that the grant award may be funded; or
- (3) the Metropolitan Council finds the project to be inconsistent, and submits the consistency issue for final determination to a panel, which determines the project to be consistent. The panel is composed of a member appointed by the chair of the Metropolitan Council, a member appointed by the joint powers board, and a member agreed upon by both the chair and the joint powers board.

For this second solicitation, nine project grant applications were submitted to the CTIB to receive funding during CY 2010. The attached table lists the project name, grant applicant, funding requested, and provides a short description of the project and a recommendation regarding the project's consistency with the 2030 TPP. It is recommended that all of the submitted applications be found consistent with the plan.

It should be noted that while it is recommended that the Washington County application to purchase land for a park and ride along the TH61 express bus transitway be found consistent with the plan, the review does not find that the provision of transit service to any of the proposed sites is warranted or would be cost-effective at this time or in the near future. In addition, the proposed northern-most site does not provide convenient bus or pedestrian access to TH61 and would not be an appropriate park and ride site to consider for express bus service. Washington County should not anticipate that Metro Transit service will be provided to any of the proposed sites unless a future analysis indicates a change in demand.

Rationale

Under the state law, the projects cannot be funded until a determination has been made by the Council regarding the project's consistency with the transit portion of the Council's Transportation Policy Plan. The consistency finding will allow the CTIB to award grants to the project applicants for CY 2010.

Funding

None required.

Known Support / Opposition

No known opposition.

Business Item 2009-332 Attachment

Summary of CTIB CY 2010 Project Grant Applications

Project Name	Project Applicant	Funding Request	Project Description	Recommendation on Consistency with the 2030 TPP
Operating Projects				
1 Hiawatha LRT Operations	Metropolitan Council	\$7,295,352	This project requests 50% of the net cost to operate Hiawatha LRT.	Consistent: Hiawatha LRT is a completed transitway.
2 Northstar Commuter Rail Operations	Metropolitan Council	\$5,726,553	This project requests 50% of the net cost for the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area's share to operate Northstar Commuter Rail.	Consistent: Northstar is a completed transitway.
3 Cedar Avenue Lakeville and Cedar Grove BRT Express Operations	Metropolitan Council	\$164,881	This project requests 50% of the net cost to operate BRT express service from the Lakeville Cedar park-and-ride and the new Cedar Grove transit center on the Cedar Avenue BRT line.	Consistent: The 2030 TPP identifies Cedar Avenue BRT as a transitway that is complete/construction/final design/preliminary engineering. Elements of the project are presently under construction, with some BRT service operating in the corridor.
4 I-35W Lakeville BRT Express Operations	Metropolitan Council	\$106,017	This project requests 50% of the net cost to operate BRT express service from the Lakeville Kenrick Avenue park-and-ride on the I-35W BRT line.	Consistent: The 2030 TPP identifies I-35W BRT as a transitway that is complete/construction/final design/preliminary engineering. Elements of the project are presently under construction, with some BRT service starting in the corridor.
Capital Projects				
5 Central Corridor LRT	Metropolitan Council	\$66,026,475	This project requests capital funding for final design, acquisition of real estate, continuation of 4 th Street advance utility relocation under FTA Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) authority, advance traffic improvements in and around the University of Minnesota under FTA LONP authority, other construction activities and procurement of light rail vehicles during CY 2010.	Consistent: The 2030 TPP identifies Central Corridor as a transitway that is complete/construction/final design/preliminary engineering. Central Corridor received its record of decision and is positioning to apply to enter final design.
6 I-35W BRT Phase I	Metropolitan Council	\$2,750,000	This project requests capital funding for physical improvements at Bloomington's 82 nd and 98 th Streets South for quick access to off-line stations and for seven BRT buses in CY 2010. These investments will support Phase I of I-35W BRT station-to-station service.	Consistent: The 2030 TPP identifies I-35W BRT as a transitway that is complete/construction/final design/preliminary engineering. Elements of the project are presently under construction, with some BRT service starting in the corridor.
7 Cedar Avenue BRT Bus Shoulder Lanes	Dakota County	\$3,217,900 in CY 2010 with commitment of \$17,704,480 over CY 2010-2012	This project requests capital funding for construction of the dedicated bus shoulder lanes for Cedar Avenue BRT. Grant award for application ensures Dakota County will have sufficient funds to allow for award of the entire construction contract in 2010.	Consistent: The 2030 TPP identifies Cedar Avenue BRT as a transitway that is complete/construction/final design/preliminary engineering. Elements of the project are presently under construction, with some BRT service operating in the corridor.
8 Southwest LRT	Hennepin County	\$9,000,000	This project requests capital funding for preliminary engineering in CY 2010.	Consistent: The 2030 TPP identifies Southwest LRT as a transitway under development. The project is presently working to complete Alternatives Analysis and prepare its Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

9	Washington County Transitways	Washington County	\$2,550,000	This project requests capital funding for real estate acquisition in the City of Newport in CY 2010 for the construction of a park-and-ride/future commuter rail station.	Consistent: The Newport park and ride/station would be located within the Red Rock corridor, which is identified in the 2030 TPP as both an express bus corridor with transit advantages and a transitway under development as LRT/Busway/BRT/Commuter Rail. The project is presently in the Alternatives Analysis phase of development. While it is recommended that the project be found consistent with the long-range plan, the Council's review does not find that the provision of express bus transit service to any of the proposed sites is warranted or would be cost-effective at this time or in the near future. In addition, the proposed northern-most site does not provide convenient access for buses or pedestrians to TH61 and would not be an appropriate park and ride site to consider for express bus service. Washington County should not anticipate that Metro Transit service will be provided to any of the proposed sites unless a future analysis indicates a change in demand.
---	----------------------------------	----------------------	-------------	---	--