

1.1 Senator ..... moves to amend S.F. No. 1345 as follows:

1.2 Delete everything after the enacting clause and insert:

1.3 "Section 1. [473.4487] GUIDEWAY COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.

1.4 Subdivision 1. Definitions. (a) For purposes of this section, the following terms have  
1.5 the meanings given.

1.6 (b) "Commissioner" means the commissioner of transportation.

1.7 (c) "Project options" means the proposed guideway and each alternative identified  
1.8 pursuant to subdivision 2, paragraph (b).

1.9 (d) "Project originator" means (1) a county or statutory or home rule charter city, or the  
1.10 commissioner of transportation, that performs and leads initial guideway planning and  
1.11 project development prior to the transfer of project leadership to the council; or (2) the  
1.12 council if initial guideway project development is performed by the council.

1.13 Subd. 2. Analysis required. (a) Prior to the selection of a locally preferred alternative,  
1.14 the project originator must perform a cost-benefit analysis as described by this section. The  
1.15 project originator must submit the analysis to the commissioner and the Metropolitan Council  
1.16 within 30 days of completing the analysis. The commissioner must post the final analysis  
1.17 on the Department of Transportation website. The chair of the Metropolitan Council must  
1.18 post the final analysis on the council's website. The commissioner and the chair must jointly  
1.19 submit a copy of the final report to the legislative auditor and to the chairs and ranking  
1.20 minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over transportation finance  
1.21 and policy.

1.22 (b) The project originator must determine alternatives that would serve substantially the  
1.23 same area as the proposed guideway but would provide service in a different manner. At a  
1.24 minimum, the alternatives must include an arterial bus rapid transit line, a regular route bus  
1.25 service line and a nontransit option that expands capacity of the road. If the project originator  
1.26 determines that a nontransit capacity expansion option is not feasible, the project originator  
1.27 is not required to include that option in the analysis but must include in the analysis a detailed  
1.28 explanation of why the option was determined to be unfeasible.

1.29 (c) At a minimum, the analysis must include the following information:

1.30 (1) for guideway and busway project options, the estimated ridership numbers;

1.31 (2) if the road capacity expansion option is feasible, the number of additional vehicles  
1.32 accommodated by the expansion;

2.1 (3) for each transit project option, an estimate of the increase or decrease in the number  
2.2 of transit riders;

2.3 (4) the amount of revenue derived from or attributable to each project option, including  
2.4 but not limited to fares;

2.5 (5) for each project option, the estimated ongoing operating and capital maintenance  
2.6 costs, which entity will pay for the costs, and the percentage of the costs to be paid by each  
2.7 entity;

2.8 (6) for each project option, the estimated future capital costs, which entity will pay for  
2.9 the costs, and the percentage of the costs to be paid by each entity;

2.10 (7) the estimated economic benefit attributable to each project option, including but not  
2.11 limited to new or expanded housing units or businesses;

2.12 (8) for each project option, the estimated timeline for construction;

2.13 (9) for each project option, travel time along the route from end to end and for various  
2.14 points of interest in between, including time spent waiting for transit, changing modes of  
2.15 transportation, and other time spent directly related to travel but not inside of a vehicle; and

2.16 (10) for each project option, the estimated increase or decrease in carbon emissions or  
2.17 other environmental pollutants.

2.18 (d) The analysis must also determine how many miles of arterial bus rapid transit, regular  
2.19 route bus service, or congestion mitigation construction could be funded for the amount  
2.20 proposed to be spent on the guideway.

2.21 **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This section is effective the day following final enactment and  
2.22 applies to all guideways seeking state or federal funding on or after that date, except this  
2.23 section does not apply to the Gold Line bus rapid transit project and the Purple Line bus  
2.24 rapid transit project. This section applies in the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin,  
2.25 Ramsey, Scott, and Washington. "

2.26 Amend the title accordingly