

Gateway Corridor Commission
April 14, 2011
Woodbury City Hall, Birch Room

Members	Agency	Present
Rafael Ortega	Ramsey County	x
Lisa Weik	Washington County	x
Kathy Lantry	St Paul	
Will Rossbach	Maplewood	x
Paul Reinke	Oakdale	x
Mary Giuliani Stephens	Woodbury	x
Dean Johnston	Lake Elmo	x
Dan Kylo	West Lakeland	x
Randy Nelson	Afton	x
Brian Zeller	Lakeland	
Victoria Reinhardt, Alternate	Ramsey County	
Gary Kriesel, Alternate	Washington County	
Paul Rebholz, Alternate	Woodbury	
Brett Emmons, Alternate	Lake Elmo	
Dave Schultz, Alternate	West Lakeland	
Pat Snyder, Alternate	Afton	
Peg Larson, Alternate	Lakeland	

Ex-Officio Members	Agency	Present
Greg Watson	Woodbury Chamber of Commerce	x
Mike Amundson	Baytown Township	
Doug Stang	3M	
Richard McNamara	Oakdale Business and Professional Association	
Tim Ramberg	St. Croix County	
Zach Schwartz	St Paul Chamber of Commerce	x

Others	Agency
Ted Schoenecker	Washington County
Mike Rogers	Ramsey County RRA
David Jessup	City of Woodbury
Josh Straka	Congresswoman McCollum's Office
Dave Schultz	West Lakeland Township
Mary Richardson	CTIB Administrator
Stephen Ebner	West Lakeland Township
Josh Collins	Ramsey County
Clint Gridley	City of Woodbury
Shelly Schafer	Senator Al Franken's Office
Rachel Horn	Congresswoman Bachmann's Office
Tim Mayasich	RCCRRA

Due to lack of quorum, the meeting began with agenda item #5 at 3:35 p.m.

Agenda Item #5. Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) Presentation

Mary Richardson from CTIB distributed copies of her PowerPoint Presentation to everyone present. She gave an overview of who CTIB is and their purpose.

The Gateway Corridor Commission was called to order at 3:59 p.m. by Chair Weik.

Agenda Item #1. Introductions

Introductions were omitted due to the rearrangement of the agenda.

Agenda Item #2. Approval of Agenda

No changes were made to the agenda. Motion made by Ortega to approve agenda. Seconded by Johnston. **Approved.** Motion carried.

Agenda Item #3. Summary March 10, 2011 Meeting

No changes were made to the March 10, 2011 meeting summary. Motion by Johnston to approve the meeting summary. Seconded by Nelson. **Approved.** Motion carried.

Agenda Item #4. Consent Items

- a. Checks and claims: Motion by Johnston to approve the consent items. Seconded by Reinke. **Approved.** Motion carried.

Agenda Item #6. Gateway Corridor AA Update

Item 6a. AA FAQ: Schoenecker said we are revamping the web site to have targeted specific questions and answers about the Alternative Analysis. The web site will still highlight who the Commission is and activities of the Commission, but will also address the AA in greater detail.

Item 6b. Additional (Eighth) Alternative: Schoenecker said prior to public meetings, the Commission approved going forward with seven alternatives. Since holding open houses and having discussions with other agencies, there is a proposed eighth alternative being the inclusion of a managed lane built from St. Paul east to Hudson. The suggestion has gone through both the PAC and the TAC, and both groups have made recommendations to add that alternative. The consultant scope of work includes the analysis of only 7 alternatives. Therefore, the eighth alternative would require an amendment to the contract, including scope of work and costs. The consultant said the costs associated with adding an eighth alternative would be approximately \$100,000. Adding another alternative hits on 10 of the 17 scope of work tasks required for the study. The budget for the study is \$1.4 million with a \$50,000 contingency. The Commission could use the contingency dollars and ask Ramsey County, Washington County, and the Met Council to fund the other \$50,000. Another option could be to retain the contingency and ask those three funding partners to fully participate in the full amount of the added scope of work. Ortega asked how much money is in contingencies. Weik said there is \$50,000 in the study budget and \$10,000 in our administrative budget. Ortega said it is important that we maintain our contingencies and suggested getting the money from the funding partners. Schoenecker said we would ask 40% from the two counties and 20% from the Met Council. Weik agreed that is a good suggestion. Rossbach asked how this came about. Weik said some is state driven and was addressed in the PAC meeting. Schoenecker said it has originated from two places: one is through discussion with

the PAC, specifically from the City of Minneapolis, and secondly, from the region itself. Met Council and Mn/DOT are looking at these lanes in greater detail and are looking at adding one between the two downtowns. Weik said the timing might not line up, it's unknown, but it is good news that the east metro is getting recognition. Ortega said the AA is a very important building block for everything we do in the future and managed lanes are a viable option. We should have included managed lanes in this initial step as a part of the foundation. It would be more expensive and difficult to go back and get the information. Weik concurred. Rossbach asked if individual cars would pay part of the lane cost. Schoenecker said a single vehicle driver can pay to utilize that lane. Rossbach agreed that it should be part of the study, but doesn't see it as a good multimodal solution. Schoenecker said we can finalize the funding pieces at the May meeting.

Agenda Item #7. Resolution of Support – St. Croix River Bridge Crossing

A draft resolution was included in the packet. Rossbach said he is failing to see the connection between the task of what we're doing and us supporting the bridge. Weik said it's a regional view and there is impact on both projects. As time goes on, I-94 will reach capacity sooner if we don't build a new bridge, causing more congestion on our corridor. Rossbach said passing a resolution has no bearing or effect on the Alternative Analysis that we're proceeding with; a bridge will not be built during the timeframe that this Commission is meeting or doing our analysis. Weik said it would have a great impact on this corridor if the Stillwater Bridge is shut down. It also speaks a lot to the local projects and supporting our congressional representatives and elected officials. Rossbach said he doesn't support a mega bridge; spreading out the population runs counter to people who support multimodal transportation. It runs against the general thought that we want to supply mass transit; therefore, working against our own effort. Giuliani Stephens agreed that there isn't a benefit for this Board to get into the size, design, and location but we can support the general concept of a new St. Croix River crossing. Nelson said it affects the numbers and could affect what mode of transit we may choose. By supporting it we can help move the next group forward in getting a bridge built. Weik asked if anyone thought it would be detrimental to this Commission to pass a resolution of support. Rachel Horn, from Congresswoman Bachmann's office, said Congresswoman Bachmann doesn't make requests for transportation unless there is local support. Having a resolution on file is helpful to them. Shelly Schafer, from Senator Franken's office, said they are currently in a fact-finding mode and haven't taken a position yet. Weik said, from a regional perspective, the two projects do impact each other on some level; therefore, it would be beneficial to have a resolution of support. Johnston said the resolution is tailored to be sensitive to have minimum impact on our mission.

Motion by Johnston to approve the resolution. Seconded by Reinke. Ortega, Weik, Reinke, Giuliani-Stephens, Johnston, Kylo, and Nelson in favor. Rossbach opposed. **Approved.** Motion carried.

Agenda Item #8. Communications

Item 8a. Social Media: Schoenecker reviewed the presentation provided in the packet including current outreach, what social media is, and a detail of Tunheim's scope of work for a Facebook page. He said the keys are creating the page and then maintaining it. Kylo asked what Tunheim bills hourly. Schoenecker said it depends on who does the work. Nelson asked if the \$8,000 would come from the Gateway Commission operating contingency. Weik said yes, but it isn't a lump sum contract, adding that she is hesitant about spending \$8,000 of the \$10,000 contingency in March. Ortega asked what the time frame is for the \$8,000. Schoenecker said it expires at the end of 2011. Ortega asked if there is any way we see a cost benefit. Schwartz suggested a more important question to consider is what role

does creating this page and paying for this administration have for the Gateway Corridor Commission and the Alternative Analysis. We use social media at the Chamber and it is valuable, but you first have to understand what value it brings to what you are trying to accomplish. Weik said that Bob Hughes, a representative that comes to the PAC meetings, is very articulate and very passionate about getting this out to the college community. We are in a public comment period, so this really isn't to advertise or promote the Gateway, and we could create a false impact about timing with a Facebook page. We could do radio ads to target the college students, and Hughes thought that was a good idea. Weik said maybe a year from now would be better when we have the information from the AA study. She said she is willing to do additional outreach activities to area clubs and chambers. Weik also wants people to think about the fact that Facebook is not a permanent entity; is there a risk in spending public money with someone that has no obligation to us. Giuliani Stephens said she is a huge proponent of social media, but agreed that we might want to think about what's the best timing. Nelson commented that the suggestion came from a WI partner, and we should discuss getting some funding from them. Weik said they don't have the opportunity to contribute at this time. Ortega asked where the conversation with Hughes was left. Weik said he said he would be fine with waiting a year. Ortega said we want to make sure we keep passionate folks like him engaged. Nelson agreed, but we need to partner with the dollars when we are crossing the river. Ortega said keeping people engaged is more important than the dollar. Weik commented that Hughes said he will start getting items from the Gateway web site and put them on his Facebook page.

Item 8b. Google Analytics Update: Schoenecker highlighted that when the open houses occurred there was a big spike. The spike correlates to us getting information out there about the open houses. Many of the hits came from press release links. This shows that when we put the resources out there, it is effective in reaching the people.

Agenda Item #9. Legislative Update

Item 9a. State: Rogers said the House and Senate have both passed transportation bills as part of the larger overall budget. The House bill is much more of a cut to transit than the Senate bill; the Senate is \$40 million in cuts and the House is \$120 million in cuts. The House bill tries to backfill some of that money by taking CTIB money, and the Senate does not have a CTIB provision. Impacts would be significant; changes in transit if these cuts go through could include raised bus fares and significant route cuts. Giuliani Stephens said GEARS sent a letter to Representative Beard today in strong opposition of eliminating those funds.

Item 9b. Federal: Rogers said there was an agreement for \$38 billion in cuts to prevent the government shut down. It is being voted on later today and tomorrow and would fund the government through September 30th, the end of the fiscal year 2011. There were significant cuts to high speed rail and transit. On the transit side, we don't expect those cuts to hurt the Central Corridor or the Union Depot. There will be a challenge on the Federal side to keep the transportation funding up and discussions on how to maintain and increase revenue. Ortega asked where Amtrak is in all this. Rogers said they did receive a cut; however, they are funded through PRIIA. Ortega commented that the six-year bill is not all about rail, but also includes highways and roads.

Agenda Item #10. Other

Item 10a. Meeting Summary: Schoenecker said the information included in the packet is to highlight activities so the Commission is aware of other meetings: TAC and PAC. He also provided a summary

sheet of outreach events, past and future, to keep entities along the Corridor engaged. Weik said the presentations have generated a lot of interest; she has had comments that the bus ridership numbers aren't very high and people wonder if there are transit interests out there. She pointed out that the Met Council doesn't offer robust bus service out here, and all day bus service would incorporate higher numbers. Schoenecker said it's good to get out to these groups; they are the groups that may not necessarily go to a web site or come to an open house, but will attend as part of the Lion's Club, etc.

Item 10b. Bus Tour Update: Schoenecker said we are proposing to look at a tour of other Corridors and also van type tour of our Corridor. We would also create a tour map to go on your own time if you're unable to attend the van tour.

Item 10c. Commission Meeting Time: Members agreed to keep the meeting time of 3:30 to 5:00.

Agenda Item #11. Adjourn

Johnston moved to adjourn. Seconded by Giuliani Stephens. **Approved.** Motion carried. Weik called the meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.