

Metropolitan Council

Metropolitan Council Chambers, 390 No. Robert St., St. Paul, Mn. 55101

Meeting of the Central Corridor Management Committee
February 10, 2010

Members Present	Peter Bell, Chair	Kathleen O'Brien	Reynaldo Aligada
	Jim Westerhaus	Rafael Ortega	Peter McLaughlin
	Toni Carter	Nancy Homans (Alt)	Khani Sahebjam
	Peter Wagenius (Alt)		
Members Absent	Paul Krause	Tom Hanson	Chris Coleman
	R.T. Rybak	Robert McFarlin	

1, CALL TO ORDER

A quorum was not present when Chair Peter Bell called the February 10, 2010 meeting of the Central Corridor Management Committee to order at 1:10 pm at the Metropolitan Council offices at 340 North Robert St., St. Paul. Bell proceeded with the meeting business while waiting for a quorum, after which the minutes from the last meeting can be approved.

2. APPROVAL OF 1/20/10 MINUTES

A quorum was reached during the regular business of the CCMC after which a motion was made by O'Brien, seconded by Westerhaus to approve the minutes from the 1/20/10 meeting. **Motion carried.**

3. BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL (BAC) REPORT

Karri Plowman reported that members of the Business Resource Collaborative (consisting of 40+ businesses among others) have been meeting 3-4 times/weekly to work on the Business Mitigation Plan. They are now sharing the draft plan with elected officials. Plowman expects to bring the plan to the March CCMC meeting.

4. FTA NEW STARTS UPDATE

Mark Fuhrmann presented this item to the committee. There are six new sites being considered for New Starts funding by the FTA, CCLRT is one of the six. There are 12 other projects ahead of CCLRT. The overall rating of CCLRT was upgraded by the FTA from "medium" (last year) to "medium high"; this rating was based on information prior to the addition of the three infill stations. Mr. Fuhrmann also noted that Central Corridor has the highest rating of any current New Starts projects.

5. UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA MOU #2 UPDATE

Peter Bell began the discussion with an update of the litigation brought on by MPR and another by various community groups. He stated that MPR has initiated litigation based on their interpretation of the MOU signed in April 2009. Bell presented an excerpt of language from the

MOU regarding the noise and vibration mitigation with the floating rubber slab. Metro Council will vigorously contest the litigation and also try to recoup legal expenses.

The community group's litigation will also be contested vigorously. Bell expressed disappointment that the community groups initiated the litigation after the three infill station construction mechanism was provided. Bell acknowledged the work of the FTA, City of St. Paul, and philanthropic community to bring about the mechanism to build the three infill stations.

Discussion followed regarding the MPR litigation.

Sahebjam asked for clarification of the criteria used to choose the rubber pad, and asked if this has been used elsewhere. Rich Rovang, CCPO, responded that the CCPO looked at both functionality and cost. The rubber pad has been used in 11 of 12 systems in North America and is almost universally accepted. Fuhrmann added that there is a climactic impact to the steel spring (GERB) system vs the rubber pad. The GERB system has not been installed in a climate like we have here, the impacts of salt used on the roads is not known. Bell stated that CCPO will not substitute others' engineering above the professionals hired to work on CCLRT. This could set a dangerous precedent as to the engineering party responsible for the line.

Regarding the University of Minnesota MOU #2, Bell called upon Kathleen O'Brien from the U of M to update. O'Brien stated that the minutes from the January 20, 2010 CCMC meeting give a fair character of the work that is being done. Last Saturday (2/06), Bell made some offers to the U of M on some points; the U of M is considering and preparing a response to Bell's offer(s).

6. SAINT PAUL INFILL STATIONS – SCHEDULE AND BUDGET IMPACTS

Mark Fuhrmann reported that 2 years ago the infill station infrastructure was approved and now all three infill stations are becoming a reality. The project maps are being changed to include these stations. They are being incorporated into the Civil East base bid package. The budget is being adjusted; the adjusted baseline budget being conveyed to the FTA is \$956.9 M. In response to committee member questions, Fuhrmann stated that the funding projections for the infill stations do not include public art at the stations. Fuhrmann stated that once funding is identified for the stations, the station art committee could follow the procedure used in the previous station art selections.

7. SCHEDULE OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Chris Beckwith, CCPO Project Controls Manager, presented the types of construction contract packages, bidding schedule, procurement package/RFPs/LONPs needed and the schedules for same. There were no questions from committee members.

8. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT – CONSTRUCTION PHASE

Robin Caufman stated that the project has been evaluating the CAC/BAC and the communication/outreach functions, and role of the CCPO as a transition is made to be more construction-oriented. The CCPO is working on setting up committees (to be named – possibly "Construction Communication Committee"). These committees are proposed to be led by Metro Council staff; each Community Outreach Coordinator would be assigned to a 2-mile segment. The committees would be made up of business and property owners, residents and stakeholders such as District Councils/neighborhoods, ADA representatives, transit users. One committee (4th Street Construction Communication Committee) was formed in August 2009. Caufman

presented the notification schedule, the CCPO and contractors roles in the outreach. Caufman answered questions from committee members concerning the reach of the road closure notifications and construction updates, and other methods to be used to notify the public (Metro Council and Metro Transit websites, maps shared with businesses for their vendors and customers). At McLaughlin's request, Caufman will inquire into posting road closures on MnDOT's website during her 2/11 meeting with MnDOT.

9. CONTRACTOR INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Chris Weyer, Asst. Project Dir. For Construction on CCLRT, presented the benefits – both goodwill and financial, possible incentive amounts, process and evaluation criteria of a Contractor Incentive Program. McLaughlin questioned whether this had been done on other projects. Weyer answered that it had been done elsewhere; similar projects offered incentives of approximately \$100,000 per mile. The FTA website lists this as a recommended best practice. Carter suggested that, since much has been learned with the 4th Street utility project in St. Paul, perhaps some items (example – types of signage) could be negotiated as part of the contract prior to construction.

ITEMS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Ortega asked when the committee could expect feedback and reports on the results of the bids as they relate to DBE goals. Fuhrmann stated that Wanda Kirkpatrick, Director of Office of Diversity and Equal Opportunity, is scheduled to appear before the CCMC on March 10, 2010 to give an overview of the DBE goals and results, and then give updates to the committee as it wishes. Kirkpatrick stated that the contractor must go through a DBE process before being approved, and the majority of bidders on CCLRT are meeting or exceeding the goals. Ortega requested on-going reports and corrective actions taken during construction, if such actions are necessary.

The committee also requested an update of the 4th Street Advanced Utility Construction DBE status at the March 10 CCMC meeting.

Carter asked for a timeframe for performing the Transit Study (sector study) that was committed in the FEIS. Fuhrmann replied that the study will happen in 2012, as it was committed to be performed two-years prior to revenue service of the line.

5. NEXT MEETING – March 10, 2010, at 1:00 p.m.

A motion was made by Wagenius, seconded by Ortega to adjourn the meeting at 2:25 p.m.

Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted, LuAnne Major