

This Document can be made available in alternative formats upon request

State of Minnesota

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD SESSION

H. F. No. 1967

02/20/2023

Authored by Petersburg

The bill was read for the first time and referred to the Committee on Transportation Finance and Policy

1.1 A bill for an act
1.2 relating to transit; requiring a cost-benefit analysis for proposed guideways;
1.3 requiring a report; proposing coding for new law in Minnesota Statutes, chapter
1.4 473.

1.5 BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA:

1.6 Section 1. 473.4487 **GUIDEWAY COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS.**

1.7 Subdivision 1. **Definitions.** (a) For purposes of this section, the following terms have
1.8 the meanings given.

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

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

1.12 (d) "Responsible governmental unit" means the unit of government responsible for the
1.13 environmental analysis of the project.

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

2.1 (b) The responsible governmental unit must determine alternatives that would serve
2.2 substantially the same area as the proposed guideway but would provide service in a different
2.3 manner. At a minimum, the alternatives must include an arterial bus rapid transit line, a
2.4 regular route bus service line, and a nontransit option that expands capacity of the road.

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

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

2.7 (2) for the capacity expansion option, the number of additional vehicles accommodated
2.8 by the expansion;

2.9 (3) for each project option, an estimate of the increase or decrease of the number of
2.10 vehicles on the road;

2.11 (4) the amount of revenue derived from or attributable to each project option, including
2.12 but not limited to fares, tax on gasoline, and motor vehicle sales tax;

2.13 (5) for each project option, the estimated ongoing maintenance costs, which entity will
2.14 pay for the costs, and the percentage of the costs to be paid by each entity;

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

2.17 (7) the estimated economic benefit attributable to each project option, including but not
2.18 limited to new or expanded housing units or businesses, increased freight movement, and
2.19 reduction of supply chain issues;

2.20 (8) for each project option, the estimated timeline for construction, road closures, and
2.21 detours and an estimate on how that timeline affects the surrounding areas;

2.22 (9) for each project option, an estimate of whether vehicle collisions will increase or
2.23 decrease due to a change in the projected number of vehicles on the road;

2.24 (10) for each project option, an analysis of whether each project option could be altered
2.25 or stopped once construction is started and the estimated costs related to alteration or
2.26 stopping;

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

2.30 (12) for busway and guideway project options, how travel time for vehicles would be
2.31 affected by any estimated reduction in vehicle traffic; and

3.1 (13) for each project option, the estimated increase or decrease in carbon emissions or
3.2 other environmental pollutants.

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

3.6 (e) A responsible governmental unit may request assistance from the commissioner or
3.7 the Metropolitan Council. The commissioner or the Metropolitan Council must provide the
3.8 requested assistance and may bill the responsible governmental unit for reasonable expenses
3.9 incurred in providing the assistance.

3.10 **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION.** This section is effective the day following
3.11 final enactment and applies to all guideways seeking state or federal funding on or after
3.12 that date, except this section does not apply to the Gold Line bus rapid transit project. This
3.13 section applies in the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and
3.14 Washington.

3.15 Sec. 2. **GUIDEWAY COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS; TRANSITION.**

3.16 (a) This section applies to a guideway for which a locally preferred alternative has been
3.17 selected prior to the effective date of this section but is not in revenue operation on the
3.18 effective date of this section, except this section does not apply to the Gold Line bus rapid
3.19 transit project.

3.20 (b) For each guideway subject to this section, the commissioner of transportation and
3.21 the Metropolitan Council must perform a cost-benefit analysis as required by Minnesota
3.22 Statutes, section 473.4487, subdivision 2, paragraphs (b), (c), and (d). Within 30 days of
3.23 completing a cost-benefit analysis required by this section, the commissioner must post the
3.24 final analysis on the Department of Transportation's website and the Metropolitan Council
3.25 must post the final analysis on the council's website. The commissioner and the council
3.26 must jointly submit a copy of the final report to the legislative auditor and to the chairs and
3.27 ranking minority members of legislative committees with jurisdiction over transportation
3.28 finance and policy.

3.29 **EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION.** This section is effective the day following
3.30 final enactment and applies in the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey,
3.31 Scott, and Washington.