

From: Lindy Crawford
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 4:44 PM
To: ward1; ward2; Dan Jones; ward4; ward5
CC: Mayor; Gilchrist, Troy J.
Subject: Draft Resolution Opposing Purple Line
Attachments: Resolution Opposing Purple Line_02252022.pdf; 8A - 2 Resolution Opposing Purple Line.DOCX

Importance: High

Good afternoon City Council,

With the hopes of having a productive Council meeting on March 8th the Mayor and I have revised the resolution for consideration.

Attached please find the revised draft resolution (PDF). For comparison, attached is the draft resolution (Word) presented at the February 22nd Council meeting.

I hope to gather your comments, questions or concerns prior to the upcoming meeting, understanding that further discussion may ensue at the meeting. Should you wish, please send comments, questions or concerns to me no later than 12:00pm on Wednesday, March 2nd.

Thank you,



Lindy Crawford
City Manager

City of White Bear Lake
4701 Highway 61 N.
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

██████████ – Direct

██████████ – Main

lcrawford@██████████ / www.whitebearlake.org



Follow us on Facebook, Twitter & Instagram

DRAFT
RESOLUTION NO.

**RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PROPOSED PURPLE LINE
(FORMERLY RUSH LINE) BUS RAPID TRANSIT ROUTE**

WHEREAS, the proposed bus rapid transit (“BRT”) project, which was formally called the Rush Line and is now known as the Purple Line, (“Project”) was transferred from Ramsey County and is now being managed by the Metropolitan Council (“Met Council”);

WHEREAS, the proposed BRT route would run north from St. Paul and terminate in downtown City of White Bear Lake (“BRT Route”);

WHEREAS, unlike a light rail project or a change in a trunk highway, municipal consent of the affected cities is not required for a BRT project;

WHEREAS, the White Bear Lake City Council adopted Resolution No. 12061 on July 25, 2017 (“Original Route Resolution”) to identify a locally preferred alternative mode for the BRT Route at the request of the Project proposers;

WHEREAS, the proposed BRT Route requires modifications to Highway 61 at the Whitaker Street intersection, to which the City Council consented by adopting Resolution No. 12860 on October 12, 2021;

WHEREAS, White Bear Lake Councilmembers have respectively disagreed over the need for the Project and the benefit it will bring to the White Bear Lake community.

WHEREAS, the City Council understands that a great deal of work goes into planning a BRT project and selecting a route. Nothing in this Resolution is intended to criticize Ramsey County, the Met Council, or anyone else that has worked on this Project. Instead, the City Council is expressing its desire, supported by a large number of its constituents, to not have White Bear Lake be part of the BRT Route.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of White Bear Lake as follows:

1. The City Council requests that the Met Council modify the BRT Route so that it does not enter the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of White Bear Lake and to take such other actions as may be needed to accomplish the requested alteration of the BRT Route.
2. If the BRT Route is altered, the City Manager is authorized and directed to work with City staff to take such actions, and to seek any City Council approvals, as may be needed to reflect or accommodate the changed route.

DRAFT
RESOLUTION NO.

The foregoing resolution, offered by Councilmember _____ and supported by Councilmember _____, was declared carried on the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Passed:

Dan Louismet, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kara Coustry, City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO.

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE PROPOSED PURPLE LINE (FORMERLY RUSH LINE) BUS RAPID TRANSIT ROUTE

WHEREAS, the proposed bus rapid transit (“BRT”) project, which was formally called the Rush Line and is now known as the Purple Line, (“Project”) was transferred from Ramsey County and is now being managed by the Metropolitan Council (“Met Council”);

WHEREAS, the proposed BRT route would run north from St. Paul and terminate in downtown City of White Bear Lake (“BRT Route”);

WHEREAS, unlike a light rail project or a change in a trunk highway, municipal consent of the affected cities is not required for a BRT project;

WHEREAS, the White Bear Lake City Council adopted Resolution No. 12061 on July 25, 2017 (“Original Route Resolution”) to identify a locally preferred alternative mode for the BRT Route at the request of the Project proposers;

WHEREAS, the proposed BRT Route requires modifications to Highway 61 at the Whitaker Street intersection, to which the City Council consented by adopting Resolution No. 12860 on October 12, 2021;

WHEREAS, White Bear Lake Councilmembers have, for many years, respectively disagreed over the need for and cost effectiveness of the Project, including a split vote on the Original Route Resolution. The few votes the City Council have taken on the Project have narrowly passed on a 3/2 vote;

WHEREAS, concerns regarding the BRT project have continued to mount and the current City Council hereby finds and determines as follows:

- (a) Under Minnesota Statutes, section 473.399, subdivision 1, the Met Council is required to obtain input from the City Council related to a transitway project on heavily traveled corridors, including in designating the locally preferred alternative transit mode in the corridor;
- (b) While municipal consent is not required for a BRT project, the Met Council should seriously consider the wishes of the affected municipalities as BRT projects produce many of the same negative impacts as light rail projects or trunk highway alterations;
- (c) The City Council is in the best position to understand the needs of its residents and the potential impacts on the community from a major transportation project;

RESOLUTION NO.

- (d) The City Council has received a large number of comments and letters expressing concerns from residents and business owners regarding the negative impacts the BRT Project will have on the City. Among the most often repeated concerns are the impacts the bus traffic generated by the Project will have on the character of the City's cherished downtown and the direct negative effects the Project will have on local businesses;
- (e) The proposed 89 busses per day entering the downtown area of the City will negatively impact the quaint, quiet, and walkable nature of the area. Downtown White Bear Lake is a tourist destination, and the City Council agrees with the business owners that the dramatic increase in bus traffic will change the nature of the downtown area;
- (f) Ridership to and from the City will not support extension of the BRT Route to White Bear Lake. The coronavirus pandemic will have lasting effects on where people work and reduce the need to travel to a central office to work. This change in work life will dramatically reduce ridership to numbers much lower than projected, which the City believes were already set at an aspirational, rather than a realistic, level. The Minnesota Legislature has recognized the likely impact of the pandemic on public transportation ridership and has ordered a study of the issue to inform future policy decisions;
- (g) The City is aware the Met Council rerouted the Gold Line BRT to avoid the City of Lake Elmo when its City Council refused to pass a resolution to finalize a portion of the route. The line was rerouted even though a prior council had adopted a resolution in 2014 supporting the locally preferred alternative route;
- (h) The situation is similar here, except that the White Bear Lake City Council is acting affirmatively to express its desire that the Met Council adjust the BRT Route so it does not enter the City of White Bear Lake;
- (i) The City Council determines development of the project is at an early enough stage that accommodating the City Council's requested modification of the BRT Route can be accomplished without causing any major disruptions to the project; and
- (j) The City Council understands that a great deal of work goes into planning a BRT project and selecting a route. Nothing in this Resolution is intended to criticize Ramsey County, the Met Council, or anyone else that has worked on this Project. Instead, the City Council is expressing its desire, supported by a large number of its constituents, to not have White Bear Lake be part of the BRT Route.

RESOLUTION NO.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of White Bear Lake as follows:

1. The City Council requests, in the strongest of terms, that the Met Council modify the BRT Route so that it does not enter the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of White Bear Lake and to take such other actions as may be needed to accomplish the requested alteration of the BRT Route.
2. If the BRT Route is altered, the City Manager is authorized and directed to work with City staff to take such actions, and to seek any City Council approvals, as may be needed to reflect or accommodate the changed route.

The foregoing resolution, offered by Councilmember _____ and supported by Councilmember _____, was declared carried on the following vote:

Ayes:

Nays:

Passed:

Dan Louismet, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kara Coustry, City Clerk