

The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners met in regular session with the following members present: Bennett, Carter (late), McDonough, Ortega (late), Reinhardt, Rettman, and Chair Parker – 7. Absent: - 0. Also present were David Twa, County Manager, and Darwin Lookingbill, Director, Civil Division, County Attorney's Office

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All in attendance recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

### AGENDA

Commissioner Bennett moved approval of the Agenda of the June 24, 2008 Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, McDonough, Parker – 5. Nays – 0.

### MINUTES

Commissioner McDonough moved approval of the Minutes of the June 17, 2008 Board Meeting, seconded by Commissioner Reinhardt. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, McDonough, Parker – 5. Nays – 0.

[Commissioner Carter arrived at this point of the meeting.]

### HUMAN RESOURCES – 2008 Salary Rates for Building Trades Job Classes (Carpenter, Master Electrician, and Painter)

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2008-211)

WHEREAS, The salary rates for building trades job classes in the Saint Paul Area are established through negotiations between the Saint Paul Building & Construction Trades Council and area building contractors; and

WHEREAS, As a result of these negotiations, a single salary rate is established for each building trade job class, and the rate for each class is applied uniformly throughout the community with no variation from employer to employer; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and the Saint Paul Building & Construction Trades Council jointly established a salary formula to match the total compensation paid to Ramsey County building trades employees, with the total compensation paid to building trades employees affiliated with the Saint Paul Building Trades Council; and

WHEREAS, The salary formula is based on four components: wages; employer-paid insurance contributions; employer-paid retirement contributions; and, employer-paid time off benefits; and

WHEREAS, At the request of Ramsey County building trades employees, Ramsey County and the Saint Paul Building & Construction Trades Council updated the salary formula as described in the attached document entitled "*Agreement For Calculation Of Proposed Salary Rates For Ramsey County Building Trades Job Classes*"; and

*(Continued)*

WHEREAS, This document was approved by the Board of Commissioners on December 15, 1998; and

WHEREAS, Based on the updated salary formula and the 2008 salary rates for Carpenter, Master Electrician, and Painter positions affiliated with the Saint Paul Building & Construction Trades Council, the Human Resources Department has calculated new salary rates for the Ramsey County building trades job classes of Carpenter, Master Electrician, and Painter with effective dates for the new rates to coincide with the dates of the wage changes set by the Saint Paul Building & Construction Trades Council; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners, in accordance with the Personnel Act, MN Statutes §383A.282, is responsible for determining the compensation for all employees in the Ramsey County Personnel System; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners, in accordance with the provision of the Personnel Act, MN Statutes §383A.282, hereby approves the following salary rates for the building trades job classes for 2008:

<u>JOB CLASS TITLE</u>	<u>FULL-TIME HOURLY RATE</u>	<u>PART-TIME HOURLY RATE</u>	<u>EFFECTIVE DATE OF NEW RATE</u>
Carpenter	\$35.15	\$45.86	May 1, 2008
Master Electrician	\$48.55	\$61.49	May 1, 2008
Painter	\$34.11	\$44.64	May 1, 2008

HUMAN RESOURCES – Salary grade reassignment for the job classification: Environmental Health Specialist 2

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2008-212)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Human Resources Department conducted a classification/compensation review of the Environmental Health Specialist 2 classification in the St. Paul/Ramsey County Public Health Department; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Human Resources Department determined that the current classification specification, Environmental Health Specialist 2, did not adequately describe the duties of the position; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Human Resources Department revised the Environmental Health Specialist 2 classification specification; and

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Human Resources Department analyzed internal and external salary information and determined the appropriate compensation is Salary Schedule 02A, Grade 28M of the Ramsey County compensation plan; and

(Continued)

WHEREAS, The Ramsey County Human Resources Department's recommended salary grade is in accordance with the guidelines established by Ramsey County compensation policy (Resolution 95-356) and practices; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the following salary grade reassignment for the Environmental Health Specialist 2 classification:

	<u>Schedule</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Monthly Salary Range</u>
Reassigned from:	02A	26	\$3,715 - \$5,507
Reassigned to:	02A	28M	\$4,097 - \$6,069

PARKS AND RECREATION – Land Acquisition – Long Lake Regional Park

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Carter, McDonough, Parker – 6. Nays – 0. (2008-213)

WHEREAS, The City of New Brighton desires to sell a parcel of property to Ramsey County and a purchase agreement has been negotiated for the purchase of this parcel; and

WHEREAS, This parcel is adjacent to the entrance of Long Lake Regional Park and will expand the park entrance, allowing for additional landscape plantings and enhancing the park entrance; and

WHEREAS, The purchase price and the size of the parcel being purchased by the County have been determined by the square foot costs recently paid by the City of New Brighton to acquire this property; and

WHEREAS, A storm water retention pond and sewer utilities are located on a portion of this parcel and the Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department has worked cooperatively with the City of New Brighton to determine the location and shape of the storm water retention pond; and

WHEREAS, The City of New Brighton will be responsible for providing and paying for all maintenance, replacement and reconstruction of the storm water retention pond and sewer utilities; and

WHEREAS, The City of New Brighton and the Ramsey County Parks and Recreation Department have negotiated an Access Agreement for Long Term Maintenance, establishing the City's ongoing obligation for maintenance, replacement, and reconstruction of the storm water retention pond and associated sewer utilities; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the Purchase Agreement between Ramsey County and the City of New Brighton for a three-quarter acre parcel of property adjacent to Long Lake Regional Park, at the purchase price of \$300,000; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the Access Agreement for Long Term Maintenance of the storm water retention pond and associated sewer utilities between Ramsey County and the City of New Brighton; and Be It Further

*(Continued)*

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners authorizes the Chair and Chief Clerk to execute these Agreements.

[Commissioner Ortega arrived at this point in the meeting.]

REGIONAL RAILROAD AUTHORITY – Preliminary Engineering for Central Corridor transit project in accordance with MN Statute 472.3994

Commissioner McDonough introduced the draft resolution and moved its adoption, seconded by Commissioner Carter.

Commissioner McDonough said this is the Board's approval of the municipal consent process. He referred to the draft resolution and offered an amendment to the second resolved clause as follows: 'RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority staff will continue to work with project staff to refine the Union Depot alignment to maintain the Depot as a multi-modal transit hub, as well as to satisfactorily address the issues listed in Rail Authority Resolution R06-33, dated May 23, 2006, and those raised in the Preliminary Design Plan Public Comment Record compiled by Ramsey County in June 2008;'. We would reference the Regional Railroad Authority resolution passed in May 2006, that lists all of our concerns and issues that are being addressed in the DEIS, the supplemental draft DIS and will be resolved in the final EIS. We then re-emphasize that these are issues important to Ramsey County and need resolution.

Chair Parker asked about the second part of the amendment referencing the public comment.

Commissioner McDonough said his amendment included "those raised in the Preliminary Design Plan Public Comment Record compiled by Ramsey County". There are no new issues that are not in here that were raised at the public comment period, so all those issues of concern to Ramsey County are already highlighted and pointed out in the 2006 resolution.

Commissioner Carter said she seconded the motion for the purpose of discussion and appreciated hearing the amendment, so that all the concerns previously noted would be included. Additionally, we all want to ensure that this project moves forward. The cost of the project and the timing are very important and critical to us, even though there are many issues yet remaining to be resolved. She believes that in passing this motion today, the Board's intent is to ensure that we will continue to work with the Project office so that all of the issues that have been raised in Ramsey County are, in fact, deliberately addressed and resolved. She referred to the last paragraph on page two of the memo from Commissioner McDonough. It lists that there are two areas where the preliminary design plans are inconsistent with Ramsey County positions, including the additional station locations and the layout in the Union Depot area. Clearly, with the resolution being amended, there are additional areas that are listed in the May 2006 resolution.

One area that is not addressed as specifically in that 2006 resolution, is the current concern for station design and public art. She wants to ensure that as we move this resolution forward, although we understand that the public art plan is not a part of the municipal consent process, albeit many of us wish that it were, so that there would be a more comprehensive and integrated public art plan. She appreciates the work that the Metropolitan Council is doing in listening to the concerns of artists, people in the communities, and people on the Project team, including our project partners, regarding the integration of station art and station design. She expects and outlines for everyone, that we will be paying particular concern to ensure that there is a more comprehensive and integrated and inclusive planning process and outcomes for public art. If that is the understanding of the Commissioners, she is prepared to move this forward so as not to delay the project, understanding that we will have the cooperation and assistance of the Met Council in listening to our community and the artists and moving forward with a more comprehensive public art plan.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner McDonough said he appreciates Commissioner Carter raising those issues. After the last Central Corridor Management Committee meeting one of the station designs was laid out for the first time. There was a lot of conversation about how minimalistic and “cookie cutter” they were and a concern by all the partners to try to recognize that there are necessities to have certain things that are consistent throughout the line but there is some room for flexibility to add some character to the particular stations that are in different neighborhoods. The response he has received from Chair Bell and the Metropolitan Council Project office staff is that they recognize that and agree with it; he believes they will continue to make an effort to do the best they can, keeping in mind that with ADA regulations there needs to be some consistency. He feels confident that the Project Office does recognize that these stations need to have some character and recognize the communities they represent, because they will be permanent structures. After the public meeting held at the request of Commissioner Carter, with a lot of conversation about public art, he spoke again with Chair Bell and emphasized that there needs to be a better coordination between the Project Office and the arts to ensure that the budget for the art dollars are spent wisely and that we actually get something for those dollars. Chair Bell indicated that is an important issue to him. The working relationship that the Met Council has put out to work not only with Ramsey County but all the partners so far has indicated his willingness to work out the issues and come to resolutions that are satisfactory to everyone. He believes that as we continue to reinforce these issues that are important to Ramsey County through this resolution, we will have a line that everyone can have a sense of pride in.

Commissioner Bennett said he didn't see anything in here talking about University and Snelling. He asked what has been resolved on that intersection.

Commissioner McDonough said that it is an ongoing concern. We are only at about 15-20% engineering, so there are no issues that have actually had any resolution. Snelling and University is clearly a very important issue.

Commissioner Bennett said there is concern by new players regarding Cedar Street. He noted, with interest, that we tell which side of the road light rail will be coming on many of the streets downtown, but on Cedar Street there is no mention of whether it will be on the east or west side. The only mention of downtown is that it will go diagonally through the block, which is going to create an additional cost that is not mentioned. Depending upon which side of the street it goes on, there will be several parking ramps closed, which will be a large cost. There is no mention made of any of that. He is concerned about those issues. He has asked the question about “side of street” at several meetings, because at least then we would know if the buildings would lose their parking ramps and on which side they would be lost. Is there a reason why we don't have those identified? They are major concerns.

Commissioner McDonough said that in the May 2006 resolution, there is specifically a section that deals with Snelling and University and the congestion problems. That resolution has quite good detail about our concerns regarding congestion and running light rail through that intersection. The Project Office is well aware of that as being a very critical piece of this. He did not see anything that specifically addresses the alignment on Cedar; however, he met with Project Office staff about some of the issues arising along Cedar Street. He heard that no parking ramps would be closed.

Commissioner Reinhardt said the second part of the suggested amendment to the resolution refers to the comments from June 2008. This is an issue that has been talked about a lot. She believes the amendment covers the issue, because it specifically states the 2006 resolution and the public comments from June 2008.

Commissioner McDonough agreed.

*(Continued)*

Dan Soler, Metropolitan Council Project Office staff, said another document is referred to in a WHEREAS clause in the resolution. That refers to “Central Corridor LRT Ongoing Coordination and Project Partner Involvement in the Decision Making Process Beyond Municipal Consent”. That document also refers to a number of issues that will need resolution by project partners as part of the project, one of those being access issues primarily related to downtown.

Commissioner Reinhardt suggested that that language be moved into a RESOLVED clause. That was added as a friendly amendment.

(The Board went into recess due to a fire alarm and was reconvened within a few minutes.)

Commissioner Bennett said his concern is if Cedar Street turns out to be high mitigation costs, and unworkable, would we have a say in what happens next, or is it just going to be the City and the Met Council.

Mr. Soler said at this point, we would continue to refine the design and determine what the additional impacts are with regard to the Cedar Street alignment, and develop those costs, and if that results in a need for some type of change, that would become a significant change to the plans and that is something, by statute, that would come back to each of the agencies for review and approval at a later time.

Commissioner Bennett requested clarification that if it did not come down Cedar Street, it would be significant enough that the County Board would have a say, yes or no, as to where it went from there.

Commissioner McDonough said his interpretation is that a change of alignment, where it actually would not go down Cedar Street, because of issues Commissioner Bennett raised that could be of concern, and actually push this out of compliance with the FTACEI, and would have to look for a different alignment, would actually put us in the same position that we were in when we had to submit a supplemental draft DEIS because that would be such a major change.

Mr. Soler said that also is true. There are two factors; in the approval of the municipal consent plans, besides all of the detail items where all of the agencies have approved alignment, station locations, etc., if there are significant changes to the municipal consent plans in the future, those significant changes would require approval by all the project partners regardless of where they were along the alignment because they are all partners to the project; that is why they are all approving the entire municipal consent plans today. Secondly, if there is a significant change that moves the alignment similar to what was discussed around the University of Minnesota, then, yes, that also changes the environmental process as part of the project as well.

Commissioner Ortega said he has spoken with many of his downtown constituents over the past couple of weeks regarding this issue. There are serious concerns regarding the mitigation. At this point, we don't have a sense of what the mitigation costs are for Cedar or the entire segment to the Depot.

Mr. Soler said they understand where the alignment is and where the impacts are, and are now working on developing mitigations associated with that as well.

Commissioner Ortega asked if costs are known yet.

Mr. Soler said there are no costs known at this time.

Commissioner Ortega asked when there would be a sense of those costs; when would that come before the Central Corridor Management Committee?

Mr. Soler said much of the costs with regard to mitigation, especially as it relates to access, to the parking ramps referred to by Commissioner Bennett, are going to be right-of-way types of costs. Because those impacts impact private property, they become part of the right-of-way process in the project. It will be later this year when we will start to know what the appraisal values are for those properties, what the impacts are, and what those ideas are.

Commissioner Ortega requested clarification that those costs are attached to the project.

*(Continued)*

Mr. Soler answered affirmatively; those costs are attached to the project.

Commissioner Ortega said the concerns of churches, MPR, and others have yet to be looked at.

Mr. Soler said that is correct.

Commissioner Ortega said his concern isn't so much the line would be stopped, but that the sooner we get a handle on those mitigation costs, we will learn as quickly as possible what the impact is. We talk about public projects – the extra stations on University. A lot of that is based on how much contingency money is left over. If mitigation costs are high, the extra stations would not be built on University and public art is one of the line items that would go away quickly, because it is not an operational item. His concern is that we find out about these issues at least two weeks before the grant is going to be submitted. One of the issues of the Central Corridor Management Committee is that we are running out of time to address the issues, especially the mitigation down Cedar Street. He asked who would pay for the property on Cedar to 4<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Soler said right now, the property acquisition associated with the diagonal station is identified through the February 27<sup>th</sup> Corridor Management Committee resolution as being acquired by the City of St. Paul. With that assumption, the Project Office is assuming the City of St. Paul is going to acquire that property. As we know today, that deal has not been struck, so that is a concern at the Project Office. If that does not happen, the diagonal alignment is going to happen anyway, but would have to be a project cost.

Commissioner Ortega said the design of the station is a big issue and was raised to him about six weeks ago. He believes the design of the stations is a concern throughout the entire corridor. It is important to make it as distinctive to the neighborhoods as possible and reflect the qualities of our neighborhoods. Besides that is the issue of the mitigation and what that cost is going to be because that will be critical in terms of the entire budget.

Mr. Soler said the things Commissioner Ortega is talking about, such as mitigation for the churches, mitigation for access points along downtown, and mitigation associated with the diagonal station, as well as costs for mitigation in downtown St. Paul, are built into the project; there are costs for right-of-way in downtown that are built into the project, and there are contingencies on top of those costs. While all that is true, it is also correct we don't exactly know what those costs are, but continue to work on it. The quicker we get those things known, the better, because that goes toward where we are on contingency and what funds are available for additional stations, etc. He has met with the outreach coordinators. He believes he has also met with every downtown property owner from Union Depot all the way through the churches. We have met and discussed with them the issues and concerns. The next part becomes formalizing what happens to each of those properties and developing those costs.

Commissioner Ortega said the entire mitigation on the campus at the University of Minnesota was quite an issue and several weeks were spent on the issue. Dan was responsible for coming up with the various scenarios with how to mitigate. He complimented Dan Soler – he was very proud of how Dan managed the issue and the professional work that he did. Everyone was quite impressed with the options and how it was laid out, and the fact that it was such a thorough job.

Commissioner Reinhardt said we are trying to encompass all these issues within Ramsey County's resolution. The purpose of the public hearings done for Hennepin County, the City of St. Paul, Ramsey County, the Metropolitan Council, and the City of Minneapolis, was to make sure we heard all the issues that need to be addressed, and that is through mitigation. For her, the most important part of the amendment is the public hearings and the comments that were accepted. Having that be part of the resolution goes a long way toward making sure these issues don't get lost in the process. When there is a project that is

*(Continued)*

nearly \$1 billion, it is something to be rightfully concerned about that the small, but important, issues could get lost in the big picture. The amendment states loud and clear that the public comments will not get lost in this process. If it has ramifications with significant impact on the project, so be it; that is the point. Hopefully we will be able to mitigate those and be somewhat close to the budget. If not, we'll need to go back to look at that; there is a little bit of room in the budget for any of the things that need to be addressed in this project.

Commissioner Reinhardt said that when Ramsey County's resolution was forwarded to the Met Council to go forward with this, our part of the compromise was that the maintenance facility would be built behind the Depot, and ultimately to build the track in order to go around the Depot to get a seamless system for a multi-modal hub. That maintenance facility is critical. She mentioned this now so that it is not lost in this process. That is the one thing Ramsey County said was an absolute. In that resolution, we wanted to make sure that all three of the additional stations on University Avenue were "framed-in", and if money allowed, to build at least one. As far as the "framing-in", and the maintenance facility, those for her are absolutes because we were very specific. She wanted to mention that so that in moving forward that also doesn't get lost in this process. Ramsey County, in its part of the compromise, did a good job by stepping up to the table, but she does not want that to be seen as something that could go, because it can't.

Chair Parker said she believed that is in the design plans.

Commissioner Reinhardt said it is in the design plans, but this is something brought to her attention recently, and she wanted to reiterate it for the record.

Commissioner Bennett said Commissioner Ortega has done a good job in elaborating a bit more on his concerns. We keep passing resolutions getting further and further into this, and what frustrates him is that it seems to be being building from Hennepin County to Ramsey County. Also frustrating for a lot of people is that we will run out of dollars to keep us under the costs and are not getting the guarantees that we are going to get some of this done. Supposedly we solved the problem at the University of Minnesota; they've got some guarantees that they would get some mitigation done on road problems, etc., but he doesn't see those same things over here. What other sections of this route have problems like we have such as Cedar Street, University and Snelling, stations, etc., that haven't been resolved?

Mr. Soler said the University might say their issues are significantly addressed but not totally resolved in and of themselves. There isn't as much of the line in Hennepin County and the City of Minneapolis. Certainly the University of Minnesota is the biggest piece through there, but all the way from the West to the East there are still areas that have to be resolved. Minneapolis still has concerns about parking in some of their areas just like we do in the Ramsey County segment. Minneapolis has intersections that they see not as critical as Snelling and University, for example Huron, University and 25<sup>th</sup> near the football stadium, and how that is going to operate. They are concerned about how downtown Minneapolis is going to operate with regard to having double train frequency when Hiawatha and Central operate through downtown. Those are a couple things they have identified in their approval of the municipal consent plans where they've said, similar to this, "we understand, we want to move forward with the approval of the municipal consent plans but we also have a list of various concerns". The City of Minneapolis and Hennepin County also have issues to be put forward. All four agencies, both counties and both cities, are in somewhat a similar state in that all are comfortable with wanting to keep the project on track and keep it moving forward, but knowing there are still many details to be worked out; they need to be worked out, both to the satisfaction to all the parties involved, but also within the whole idea that the project has a budget and the project has contingency. Will it be able to handle all the pieces that are a part of it?

Commissioner Bennett said it seems that everything is being decided except on our end. St.

**(Continued)**

Paul has a department store hanging on by its fingernails, and probably why nobody wants to tell him on which side of Cedar Street the two lanes of tracks are going to be. If they are on the side of the department store, closing off their delivery ramp, it would be his guess that department store would be gone. If it is on the other side of Cedar Street, it is going to close off some other things. Eco Lab vehicles have to back in. Two tracks cannot be crossed over. We've got some major costs. He would hate to think of telling four buildings they must close ramp entrances, to open holes on the other side of the buildings; if it could even be done, what would their costs be. Those things seemed to be decided elsewhere. All the Board seems to be doing is passing resolutions continuing on. We have made compromises along the way, and nobody else seems to be making as many compromises as we have. He is worried that we are going to get to the end of this thing, likely stopping somewhere like Rice and University. He hopes that doesn't happen.

Commissioner Bennett said he has a major interest in Snelling and University. Snelling Avenue and White Bear Avenue are the two streets that run north to south all the way through the County, and carry a lot of traffic from the north. He has a major concern other than transit on that intersection. He asked if anyone is ready yet to say which side the line would be on Cedar Street, west or east?

Mr. Soler said the LRT (light rail transit) is on the east side of Cedar Street, in the center of Cedar Street between the Department of Human Services and the St. Paul Ramsey County Public Health Building. At that point on Cedar Street, LRT is in the center with traffic on each side. As it goes south from Tenth Street near the two churches, it transitions to the east side and runs along the east side of Cedar Street to just south of Fifth Street. At the Fifth Street intersection, LRT transitions through the block at the diagonal to the south side of Fourth, running on the south side of Fourth Street to the front of the Union Depot.

Commissioner Bennett said that means that all the ramps on the west side of the street would have one lane of traffic open going southbound being able to get in turning to the right; coming out turning to the right going southbound. Everything on the east side of the street would have to cross two tracks and that is not permissible. He asked if that is correct?

Mr. Soler said that is correct. Eco Lab's ramp and loading dock would have one lane of traffic and access, right in, right out, similar to what it does today.

Commissioner Bennett said it would be easy to get in and out, but there is no way to get any trucks in; they have to back in. He said it has taken a long time to get an answer about that. He is frustrated with this because he doesn't see Cedar Street working. It was one of his concerns two-three years ago. He sees all the decisions made everywhere else. He is inclined to vote against this today just out of protest because we have to get some action on our side of the River, and we need to start making some decisions here. Why do we always make decisions other places but not here first? There is no reason we can't be building that service station by the Depot as one of the first projects out of the chute. Something should probably be put into the resolution to make sure that is done, but the hue and cry might be that we don't know how much money we've got.

Commissioner Rettman referred to the email she distributed yesterday to the Commissioners that expressed her concern when reviewing the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of Minnesota as well as the proposed resolution for Minneapolis. They have thick lists created by staff. As much as we want to have full faith and credit with the Met Council, everyone is expendable, and if this is not memorialized in some form, then how do we come to the table to make sure our issues are done. The proposed amendment gets us partway there. A lot was covered in that resolution.

Commissioner Rettman has three concerns. In Attachment B, handwritten page 6, the Met Council overtly said, "the project, i.e., Met Council, does not intend to directly fund replacement parking but will work with the partners". It also says they see themselves as facilitators regarding

*(Continued)*

the parking issues. In the original resolution passed, the parking was not going to be 85% less along University Avenue; it was not going to have three car stations, but two car stations. It has lost a lot of parking, a lot of turning ingress and egress, a lot of U-turns. Those concerns have now come into play, and yet, the mitigation that is talked about stated as: “we will work to identify the impacts, but the Central Corridor Office was primarily responsible for facilitation”. To her that says they are willing to pay for mitigation to other places, but this one is dramatic and traumatic on University Avenue.

Commissioner Rettman said the Met Council created the referenced document, and she has a problem with that. The public input section (page 8) has been deleted. Page 5 of the same document states, “as the design proceeds, the preliminary engineering and final design will provide plan review sets for the project partners at about 30, 60, and 90%”. Staff should be very clear that Commissioners want to see this in front of this County Board, and Mr. Soler should make sure it is available for the public, in libraries and elsewhere. That is critical, and part of the concern. The 30, 60, 90% is sort of the “Whereas” statement; it doesn’t commit except to give the plans somewhere. She wants to make sure they are in front of the County Board or Regional Railroad Authority Board. Then we will begin flushing out some of these things. This is a \$1 billion handshake – Commissioner Reinhardt is right. She wants to make sure we have everything covered that the citizens want.

Commissioner Rettman said Mr. Soler and Ms. Cooper attended the same meeting she attended with Peter Bell. There is furor about the gentrification issue, the mitigation issue. They are not even addressed in this. They are addressed in Ramsey County’s resolution and why she is trying to compromise. She does not want this vote to be that we go to the table with no cards because we didn’t identify anything. She wants anyone at the table to have clear articulation that these are not just a wish list but a must list. The intensity of the people present at the meeting is very deep and similar to some of the feelings from throughout the Commissioners’ communities. Each of those issues must be addressed.

Commissioner Rettman said she is prepared to compromise with the resolution as it currently stands, but needs it articulated in the minutes that the 30, 60, 90% will be back before the County Board in its entirety, as well to make it available to the public.

Mr. Mayasich indicated that it would come before the Board.

Commissioner Rettman said, just as Commissioner Carter had stated she would not stop on art, she would not stop on the gentrification issue or the parking issue. That is a part of the project and has to be funded by this too. It is also because of but-for, the parking would there. It has to be a part of this, and if it is not in here, it is part of the original resolution. She wanted to make sure that what the County Board does today lives on after we are gone.

Commissioner Bennett asked if Commissioner Rettman is saying the 30, 60 and 90% would be on the section along University Avenue or all along the line? Would we be talking about the parking downtown along Fourth Street and Cedar Street that would be gone?

Commissioner Rettman responded it would be everything.

Mr. Soler responding to Commissioner Rettman’s point, said yes, the Met Council would have available the 30, 60 and 90% plans and the final plans for the project for staff, the County Board and the public to review and comment. The difference with this project is this is the approval stage for the plans by Statute for this project, with, at the least, the ability to see those plans, to know about them, find out what is in them, and still have time to provide comment on those plans, and it is very important. They have committed to doing a similar process to what was done with the municipal consent plans to have them available to the appropriate agencies as well as for public review, and posted on the Internet site and the FTP site. That would be for the entire project length,

*(Continued)*

downtown-to-downtown, including the maintenance facility and everything else that is a part of the project.

Commissioner McDonough said he would make sure that comes before the County Board.

Commissioner Ortega said there is concern about the maintenance facility. If the mitigation costs get high, we would not just be talking about what is on the list such as the station with a contingency, but also, if not elimination of the maintenance facility, but a scaled-down version. A scaled-down version doesn't make sense as we look down the road for high-speed rail, commuter rail, etc. That is why we need to know the timelines. We are short on time – eight weeks at maximum. He asked if that is the correct amount of time.

Mr. Soler said for when we want to have closer to 30% plans, which are PE level plans with a more refined PE level estimate – end of August, eight weeks.

Commissioner Ortega said we would have eight weeks. We would have to submit the application in September.

Mr. Soler responded affirmatively; very-early September.

Commissioner Ortega said that is a very small window if we are not thinking ahead of time about these things and how we might address them. If we have another meeting and just keep venting and passing another resolution, the train is just going to go right past us.

Mr. Soler said he would bring this back to the Met Council as well because he senses the frustration by the Ramsey County Board. It was not unrealized that there was a lot of time spent working on issues around the University of Minnesota. Chair Bell had several meetings last week with business communities, the public, the Corridor Community Advisory Committee, and there was a definite reference there, a real sense of frustration that “Hey, does anybody care about anything besides the University? – the University is getting this, the University is getting that”. They heard that at the Corridor Management Committee as well. They are moving quickly to catch up with a lot of those items. He attested that in the Project Office, from the staff's point, that they also worked on a lot of issues on the east side as well, but as they've come out for these levels of discussions, we need to catch up quickly. He would bring that message back as well. It is not only University issues; this whole east side is just as important.

[Due to a fire alarm, the Board recessed for five minutes.]

Commissioner Ortega said he has concerns, not just about all the stations, but he wants to see public art. The maintenance facility is in the budget, and if the mitigations are so high we are going to have to balance out the budget for the CEI, just like on Hiawatha where they had to cut back. He is afraid that if we don't get a first class maintenance facility, all the work this Board does on high speed or anything else... you could always say we'll do it tomorrow, but if we can do it today, let's do it today.

Commissioner Reinhardt said with all the attention paid to the University of Minnesota and the fact that we came out with our part of the compromise early on, it has taken the focus away from what we need to do here in Ramsey County, and that is what is before the Board today. There were really only two absolutes in the County's resolution, and they were the maintenance facility and the “framing-in” of those three additional stations on University Avenue. Not that there aren't other things, but those were what the Ramsey County Board voted on. If anyone thinks Ramsey County will be quiet if they somehow go back on the two absolutes in the resolution, they are wrong. They wouldn't do it with the University of Minnesota, and they are not going to get away with doing it to Ramsey County. She liked Commissioner Bennett's idea to try to tell them to start with the maintenance facility because that is an absolute. The two absolutes have been acted on and accepted by the Metropolitan Council as the method to move forward, and we absolutely must hold them to their word. They will hold us to our word.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Reinhardt said the partners all understand the other things that need to go into this; each has laid out things that are critical. So have we; those are reiterated in the resolution, and there is no compromise beyond that. In fact, we need to deal with mitigation issues as well. That is one of the reasons she brought that up. If we remain silent and assume words will be kept, that is where we may get into trouble. The University of Minnesota wouldn't do that, and neither will we.

Commissioner Bennett asked Commissioner Ortega if Ramsey County has adequate ways to address the concerns each has had on the downtown portion of the line.

Commissioner Ortega said he had been speaking with Mr. Soler during the Board's break. He had told Mr. Soler this Board needs to know as quickly as possible, even the preliminary findings, and why he spelled out the timelines – we are out of time. Staff is working very hard, but there is only so much you can do in so much time, which puts us into August. That document has to be ready to be in the mail in September. There are parallel activities going on while we are having public hearings, the engineering is still going on, there are no final results on the budget, etc., and we need to know as quickly as possible. This is about the whole understanding of what those impacts are, and then we can make better decisions about the course we want to take in terms of addressing whatever those outcomes are, which are still difficult to tell until we get the budget.

Commissioner Rettman asked Commissioner Ortega on the timeline, if he expects that to be in front of the County Board within that eight-week period.

Commissioner Ortega said that is what he was pushing for eight weeks ago; we are running out of time.

Commissioner Rettman said we need to get that on the schedule. We also need to get a timeline on the CEIs.

Commissioner Ortega said there is only so much that the staff can do; Mr. Soler and all the staff are all working very hard, they are all focused and understand the issues. He wants to make sure that we are not waiting for the final official report; that we get a sense of what is happening, what direction it is going with as much time as possible so we have a clear understanding of what that is. What if the mitigation costs are so huge that eats up into 90% of the contingency? The whole line has to be addressed.

Chair Parker said there are a lot of "what ifs".

Commissioner Ortega said he is trying to speed it up so we get it quickly.

Mr. Soler said staff from the Project Office can be available to regularly update the Commissioners at the Ramsey County Board or as they meet as the Regional Railroad Authority Board, to provide information and to be available for questions.

Chair Parker said that is a good idea. There is a lot of concern; this is the biggest project the current Commissioners have ever been involved with. At least monthly updates would be helpful, more often if needed, to the Regional Railroad Authority Board. She asked Commissioner McDonough if that sounds reasonable.

Commissioner McDonough responded affirmatively.

Mr. Soler said prior to that if there are specific things the Board wants to hear about, to let staff know and they can make sure they have answers made available.

Commissioner Bennett said the problem seems to be everything is starting west and coming this way. The University doesn't have a firm agreement but they have expectations. The only expectations Ramsey County has are what we have talked about in County Board meetings; they haven't been publicly stated by Met Council. If it had been his way from day one, this would have started at the Union Depot working to the west, and we would just be getting to the University's problem, and everything here would have been settled.

*(Continued)*

Chair Parker said it is not surprising we have had this much discussion as this is the major opportunity for the Board to have input on the preliminary design plans.

Roll Call: Ayes – Reinhardt, Rettman, Bennett, Carter, McDonough, Ortega, Parker – 7.  
Nays – 0. (2008-214)

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Council has prepared Preliminary Design Plans for the Central Corridor light rail transit line from the Union Depot in downtown Saint Paul to the Hiawatha line in downtown Minneapolis; and

WHEREAS, Ramsey County and the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority have held public hearings to gather comments on these plans; and

WHEREAS, The Metropolitan Council has committed to work with the County, the Regional Railroad Authority, and other project partners in its document titled “Central Corridor LRT Ongoing Coordination and Project Partner Involvement in the Decision Making Process Beyond Municipal Consent;” and

WHEREAS, Maintaining the project schedule will minimize costs and allow construction of the best possible project; Now, Therefore, Be It

RESOLVED, The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners hereby approves the Central Corridor preliminary design plans submitted April 28, 2008, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 473.3994; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority staff will continue to work with project staff to refine the Union Depot alignment to maintain the Depot as a multi-modal transit hub, as well as to satisfactorily address the issues listed in Rail Authority Resolution R06-33, dated May 23, 2006, and those raised in the Preliminary Design Plan Public Comment Record compiled by Ramsey County in June 2008, and in the document entitled “Central Corridor LRT Ongoing Coordination and Project Partner Involvement in the Decision Making Process Beyond Municipal Consent”; and Be It Further

RESOLVED, That Ramsey County will continue to work with the Metropolitan Council and other project partners to ensure that the project, as built, best meets the needs of the citizens of Ramsey County.

#### BOARD CHAIR UPDATE

Chair Parker said the Commissioners had received an update on the credit profile reports and that we have received the AAA bond rating. She believes it is important for the public to know that County staff have worked very hard on this. Ramsey County has again been recognized as one of only 30 counties in the country to receive this rating, which means we are in the top 1% nationally of counties, in terms of fiscal management. She thanked Mr. Twa and all the staff that have been involved in this.

*(Continued)*

OUTSIDE BOARD AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

Commissioner Reinhardt reported:

- The Rush Line Corridor Task Force met in Forest Lake. One action taken pertained to what will happen regarding the \$1 million for the first three years, once the CTIB gets everything ironed out as to what the process will be. Applications will be due to the CTIB; the process is likely to begin in September. Staff would come back in July with preliminary information to request capital funds for two park and ride lots, one of which would be in the White Bear Lake area. They have talked about getting bus line service going by September 1<sup>st</sup>. Through the discussion it became evident that that would not happen. At the July meeting, they will again consider an application for operations of the bus service for calendar year 2009. Chisago County will benefit from this bus service between Forest Lake, White Bear Lake, and into Union Depot in St. Paul. They will be going back to their rail authority and county board to request \$112,209, which is what each county's portion would be for one year of operations. Chisago County needs to take that separately because they are not part of the CTIB process. She believes it was a huge decision for the Task Force to move forward. They received good response from Washington County, which is a major player in this. We knew that the Commissioner from Anoka County would not be at the meeting, but she has been supportive of what we are trying to do in terms of getting the bus service up and running.

Additionally, federal funding for the line from Forest Lake to Minneapolis will end after this year, and they are trying to work through ways to keep that going. That is not part of Rush Line, but we want to get people into St. Paul. There is more ridership of people coming into St. Paul from Forest Lake than going into Minneapolis. The Forest Lake-Minneapolis line exceeded expectations; there is no reason to believe that we would not exceed it coming into St. Paul. The Task Force is moving forward; the application would be for funding available for three years. Again, recognizing that the CTIB still has a great deal of work to do to get that all worked out, but Rush Line is a little ahead of the rest of the group as far as their application process. That is indicative of the fact that Rush Line is ready to move ahead; others are more in the preliminary stages than Rush Line. This was an important meeting in trying to get suburban Ramsey County in the loop as far as the funding for transit and transportation because some of the criticism that has come to us is that it seems to be all about Central Corridor – what about the suburbs? Rush Line is beginning the process for the suburbs.

- She and Commissioners Rettman and Ortega attended the Joint Property Tax Advisory Committee Meeting. The July meeting will focus on the next steps.
- The second annual Taste of Maplewood was very well attended.
- Manitou Days in White Bear Lake started last week and continues. Market Fest is every Thursday evening through July and provides lots of fun for everyone.
- The final meeting of the Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force was held. The final report was approved and will go onto the commission members. The pilot projects will continue. With this legislation and the commission coming into place, they will be able to move into model #2 and/or #3 – electronic recording of real estate documents in Minnesota. It took nine years to get to this point. This was an incredible group of people, some who will be moving on to the commission. She is also working on the Foreclosure Data Committee and the policy part of that.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner Carter reported:

- She and Commissioner Parker served on the selection panel for the new Executive Director of the Community Action Program of Ramsey and Washington Counties (CAPRW). The Board decided to hire Mr. Clarence Hightower, who has previously been Executive Director at the Minneapolis Urban League. He will begin his new duties in August.
- On the Board's trip to Washington DC for the purpose of thanking and working with our legislative delegation, and mostly focus on Regional Rail. The Board shared information about the impacts specifically from the Deficit Reduction Act on targeted case management and our ability to help vulnerable children and adults remain safe and in our communities, and the impact on child support collections where \$1 returns \$4-6 in collections and helps people stay off welfare. Since then, we have received notification that the bill has passed both the House and Senate and is awaiting the signature of the president.

Commissioner Reinhardt added that there was an understanding that the White House had accepted those provisions so they would not be vetoed.

Commissioner Carter said it includes all seven provisions. Because it was worked out with the House, Senate and the President's office, he will be signing the bill. It will be good news for Ramsey County in that that impact will be delayed so those services can be continued.

- She attended a launch of the Project Voice at Hallie Q Brown Center. Project Voice is one of three partnerships that have been supported for the upcoming three years by the Children's Collaborative. There are concerns about where funds for the collaboratives will be coming from; it is known that there are two years of funding and an intent for the third year.
- She attended a Corporation for Supportive Housing Conference, which focused on housing and homelessness issues and the coordination of services to those who are homeless.
- She spoke of a play "State of the Union" that was conducted by Lex-Ham Community Center and held at the Wellstone Center this past week. She congratulated the Lex-Ham Community Center on their theatre productions.

Commissioner Rettman reported:

- She attended a meeting by Peter Bell, Met Council. The concerns were extreme and deep regarding the impact to individuals who live, work and do business along the University Avenue corridor, and about the fact that all the action is on the other side of the River, and that we are once again getting left behind. They feel this will hurt them more than help them. Mr. Bell told them there would be no sacrificial issues; however, he is committed to working within the framework of the \$840 million. People were very intense in terms of gentrification and being moved out of the neighborhood, when they have been there, making the neighborhoods survive for all these years.
- She judged ribs again this year at Shroeders.
- She attended a going away for Sr. Kathleen Spencer at More, a program that exists across from McDonough Homes. She and Nancy Christianson devoted 25 years to this community program.

*(Continued)*

Commissioner McDonough reported:

- The AMC Board spent two days at a strategic planning meeting. Much of the discussion focused on levy limits and MOEs. Their Executive Board has met with the Governor's Office and staff from the administration to try to use this as an opportunity to leverage some influence in how we have worked with the state, more as partners rather than just another special interest group. They will continue to meet and look at things that can be done as counties to elevate that discussion with the state.

Chair Parker reported:

- Rose Fest Parade was held, most of the activities are held in Central Park in Roseville.
- The Roseville Rotary will hold its first annual Taste of Roseville, highlighting all the wonderful restaurants in the community.

David Twa reported:

- That at the Joint Property Tax Advisory Committee meeting, the date of the Truth in Taxation hearing was changed to Thursday, December 11, 2008, beginning at 6:00 p.m. They are checking to make certain that Arlington High School is once again available for this hearing.

Chair Parker:

- Offered public congratulations to Dave Twa on his new position in California, and expressed sadness that he will be leaving Ramsey County in September. Mr. Twa said it is with sadness that he will leave because he has appreciated the support received from the Board over the years. This is a great place to work; he appreciates everything done for him. He is looking forward to the new challenges that this move will create for him.

#### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Parker declared the meeting adjourned.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Ramsey County Board of Commissioners met in Executive Session with all members present. Also present were David Twa, County Manager; Susan Gaertner, County Attorney; Darwin Lookingbill, Director, Civil Division, County Attorney's Office, and Patricia Leske, County Attorney's Office.

Re: Tschida v Ramsey County

The Executive Session was called to order at 11:10 a.m. to discuss the above mentioned matter.

Commissioner Reinhardt introduced a motion to authorize the Ramsey County Attorney to proceed with a settlement as discussed in this Executive Session, seconded by Commissioner Bennett.

Roll Call: Ayes – Bennett, Carter, Reinhardt – 3. Nays – McDonough, Ortega, Rettman, Parker – 4. Motion failed.

The Executive Session was adjourned at 11:25 a.m.