



Minnesota Regional Transit
Board: Records.

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.



REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
270 Metro Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
612/292-8789

MEETING OF THE REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Monday, January 5, 1987
Council Chambers
4:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of December 1, 1986, Meeting
4. REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE Paul Joyce,
Chair
 - A. Election of Officers of the Board
5. REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE Todd Lefko,
Chair
 - A. University of Minnesota Market Analysis for
Inclusion in the Transit Service Needs Assessment
Final Report
6. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE Ruth Franklin,
Chair
 - A. Award of Contracts for Metropolitan Transit
Commission (MTC) High Subsidy Routes
 - B. 1986 Exurban Special Project Fund Awards
 - C. Implementation of Additional Metro Mobility
Appropriation
 - D. Amendment to Hastings Commuter Express Service
Contract
7. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Chairman's Report
 - B. Members' Reports
 - C. Staff Reports
 - 1) Metro Mobility Update
8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Elliott Perovich
Chairman

An Equal Opportunity Employer

John Clauson
Matt Peterson

C. Fish
R.S.

DeVries
Weaver
M. Saylor

Fischer
Rosman
K.E.
J.H.
K.T.
E.K.
R.R.
J.H.
G.B.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

ROLL CALL AND ATTENDANCE SHEET

Doty
Bentley
Fulbr
Seo?

Rietow

DATE: 1/5/87
BOARD OR COMMITTEE RTB

MEMBER NAME	PRESENT	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE	VOTE
Chairman	✓					
Kenneth Bedeau (P)	no					
Doris Caranicas (P)	✓					
Ruth Franklin (Chair, A & F)	✓					
Alison Fuhr (P)	✓					
Paul Joyce (A & F)	✓					
Edward Kranz (A & F)	✓					
Todd Lefko (Chair, Policy)	✓					
Bernard Skrebes (A & F)	✓					

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Minutes of the Meeting of the
REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD
Metropolitan Council Chambers
December 1, 1986

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Elliott Perovich, Chairman; Ruth Franklin; Alison Fuhr; Paul Joyce; Edward Kranz; Todd Lefko and Bernard Skrebes

MEMBERS ABSENT: Kenneth Bedeau and Doris Caranicas

OTHERS PRESENT: Gregory Andrews, Mary Fitzgerald, Katie Turnbull, Cindy Fish, Randy Rosvold, Jerry Brechlin and Mike Kuehn, Regional Transit Board Staff; Charles Kenow, State Planning Agency; Gregory Failor, Metropolitan Transit Commission; Charles Wiger and Dirk deVries, Metropolitan Council

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. and roll taken. Franklin moved that the agenda be amended to delete the committee meeting time change and substitute the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA) Grant. Joyce seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Lefko moved approval of the minutes of the November 3, 1986, meeting; Fuhr seconded the motion. Joyce offered a friendly amendment that the last page should state that the trains outside London travel a good deal faster than 60 miles per hour; they often hit speeds in excess of 100 to 125 miles per hour. Mover and seconded accepted the friendly amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

Skrebes moved approval of the minutes of November 17, 1986. Franklin seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

REPORT OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Lefko said that the committee will discuss competitive bidding at this week's meeting, review the competitive services document and begin to develop programs and policies. At the meeting of December 17 the Citizens League will discuss its transit report.

REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

CONTINUED PARTICIPATION in I-394 MARKET RESEARCH

Committee Chair Franklin reviewed the committee report dated November 24, 1986, and moved:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into an interagency agreement with the Minnesota Department of Transportation for the continuation of the I-394 Market Research Program in an amount not to exceed \$25,000.

Skrebes seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

MINUTES
December 1, 1986
Page Two

1986 FINANCIAL AUDIT PROPOSAL

Franklin moved:

That the Regional Transit Board approve engaging the auditing firm Deloitte Haskins & Sells for the 1986 financial audit and, further, that the 1987 audit go through the process of Request for Proposal.

Joyce seconded the motion; the motion carried unanimously.

AUTHORIZATION TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT WITH URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION (UMTA) FOR \$350,000 COMPETITIVE TRANSIT GRANT

Franklin reviewed the December 1, 1986, memorandum from Robert Dietrick. The board previously approved the application for the grant and staff is now requesting authorization to enter into the agreement for demonstration and planning funds. Franklin moved:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into agreement with UMTA for the \$350,000 Competitive Transit Grant, Project No. MN-06-0019.

Lefko seconded the motion. Andrews said the agreement was received today and states the board can begin to expend funds on November 3, 1986. The motion carried unanimously.

Franklin said the committee decided at its last meeting that Administration and Finance Committee meetings will begin at 4:00 p.m. In response to Kranz' question, she said there was no interest in holding evening meetings. In her experience, evening meetings have not generated more public participation.

OTHER BUSINESS

The chairman reported on the ongoing discussions with the Department of Finance on the budget. On December 2 there is a meeting with Lt. Governor Marlene Johnson. The recommendations will be finalized the second week of January. The members discussed the status of the transfer of the Motor Vehicle Excise Tax in relation to our need for a system of funding for long-range stability.

There was discussion of the Metropolitan Transit Commission's labor contract vote, which concludes this evening. The chairman said the proposal is a three-year contract and includes some changes to the part-time issue.

Depending on activity at the Legislature, the chairman would like to schedule another retreat within three months.

MINUTES

December 1, 1986

Page Three

Kuehn discussed the December 10 RTB annual conference. Invitations were sent to all the private providers now under contract. Approximately 1,000 invitations were mailed. The chairman asked members to personally encourage local city and county officials to attend. Various approaches to building community relationships were discussed. Wiger said the Chambers of Commerce will be meeting in the near future at the Metropolitan Council.

Kuehn explained the timetable of appointments to the Metropolitan Council and the Regional Transit Board. Public meetings on board and commission appointments will be held February 3 and 4. The appointments to the commission will be made February 12.

There being no other business, Joyce moved that the meeting be adjourned. Fuhr seconded the motion; the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Fitzgerald
Secretary

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: December 26, 1986
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Nominating Committee
SUBJECT: Election of Officers of the Board

The Nominating Committee (Paul Joyce, Alison Fuhr and Ed Kranz) has conferred and agreed to the following slate of candidates for board officers to serve until the first meeting in January 1988.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Regional Transit Board approve the following slate of candidates to serve as officers of the board:

Doris Caranicas, Vice Chair
Paul Joyce, Treasurer
Mary Fitzgerald, Secretary

Paul Joyce
Chair

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
292-8789

DATE: December 18, 1986
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Policy Committee
SUBJECT: Policy Committee Action Item

At its December 17, 1986, meeting, the Policy Committee discussed and moved the following item for approval:

Recommendation: University of Minnesota Market Analysis for Inclusion
in the Transit Service Needs Assessment Final Report

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the University of Minnesota Market Analysis and Strategies contained in the December 11, 1986, staff memorandum for inclusion in the Transit Service Needs Assessment Final Report.

Other Business

Other items that were discussed at the meeting but required no action included:

- o The Citizens League Report--"New Destinations for Transit"
- o Metro Mobility Eligibility Criteria and Program Update
- o Cost Comparison Principle and Guidelines

Todd Lefko
Chair

TRANSM/TX1
jmo

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
292-8789

DATE: December 11, 1986
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Katherine F. Turnbull, Planning Manager *KT*
SUBJECT: University of Minnesota Market Analysis for Inclusion in the
Transit Service Needs Assessment Final Report

Action Requested

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the University of Minnesota Market Analysis and Strategies contained in this memorandum for inclusion in the Transit Service Needs Assessment Final Report.

Background

Due to its size and geographic location, the University of Minnesota was identified as a separate market group in the Transit Service Needs Assessment. A special analysis was conducted of the University of Minnesota market group and the Route 52 service. Due to time constraints, this analysis was not completed in time to include in the draft Transit Service Needs Assessment. The analysis included a detailed examination of student home locations, an evaluation of Route 52 service, review of on-campus parking and transportation issues, and future student enrollment projections. Therefore, Policy Committee and Board action are needed to include the analysis and strategies in the final report. The University of Minnesota analysis is summarized below. More detailed information is available in a technical memorandum.

University of Minnesota Market Analysis From the Transit Service Needs Assessment

Market Definition

The University of Minnesota market group is comprised of students, faculty and staff at the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. Outside of the two downtowns, the University of Minnesota is the third largest generator of transit trips in the metropolitan area.

Transit Need Indicators

Population and Employment

The total student enrollment for the combined Twin Cities campus is approximately 44,600. Approximately 14,000 faculty and staff are employed at the University. Some 75 percent of the students live off campus, with the remaining 25 percent residing on campus or adjacent to the campus. Mapping of student home locations indicates that while students live throughout the metropolitan area, the heaviest concentrations are found in south Minneapolis, western St. Paul, northern St. Paul suburbs, western Minneapolis suburbs, southern Minneapolis suburbs and northeast Minneapolis suburbs.

Major Generators

The Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses are both major generators for students, faculty and staff. At the Minneapolis campus, the University Hospital complex, Dinkytown and Stadium Village are also significant traffic generators.

Transit Dependents

Due to their age, income levels and limited automobile availability, many university students fall into the transit dependent market groups utilized in the Transit Service Needs Assessment.

Highway Congestion

High to moderate levels of congestion are found on most of the major free-way facilities surrounding both the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. Congestion levels are forecasted to continue to be high to the year 2000. Facilities experiencing congestion include I-94, I-35W, T.H. 36, T.H. 280 and Snelling Avenue. In addition, the local streets surrounding the campuses experience major congestion problems during the school year. Parking is a problem at the University, with demand exceeding available supply.

Travel Characteristics

The University is a major attraction of student trips in the metropolitan area. Travel from these groups is highest from areas immediately adjacent to the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses. Student travel is also high from many other parts of the metropolitan area, especially southern Minneapolis and southern suburbs, western St. Paul neighborhoods, northern St. Paul suburbs and northeast Minneapolis and northern suburbs.

Existing Transit

Current transit services oriented to the University include eight local routes, the Special Route 52 service and the intercampus Route 13 service. Route 52 service includes 12 express routes oriented to the Minneapolis campus from different parts of the metropolitan area. The operating deficit for Route 52 service is split on a 50-50 basis between the University and the public sector.

Analysis

Currently approximately 47 percent of University students, faculty and staff travel to and from the University by bus. Some 16 percent of these use Route 52 service with the remainder using regular MTC routes. A detailed analysis of the Route 52 services indicates that the subsidy per passenger levels on the 12 routes are below the \$2.45 interim standard. Operating costs for Route 52 services have increased substantially over the years to its current level of \$1,394,145. The operating deficit is split on a 50-50 basis between the University and the public sector. In contrast, the farebox recovery ratio has remained relatively stable since 1981. Analysis indicates that if Route 52 services were not available, some 20-25 peak hour buses would need to be added to regular route service and approximately 1,500 additional parking spaces would be needed at the University.

Route 52 service is focused on major concentrations of University students. However, it appears there are significant concentrations of students in areas not currently served by Route 52 service. These include the northern St. Paul suburbs of Arden Hills, Mounds View, and Roseville; Highland Park; Golden Valley and New Hope; and Hopkins and Minnetonka.

Minnesota Rideshare took over the operation of carpool and vanpool marketing at the University for the 1986/1987 school year. This change has resulted in an increase in the number of carpool applications.

Strategies

Service strategies for the University of Minnesota market group build on the existing services provided by regular MTC route service, Route 52 service, the intercampus Route 13 and Minnesota Rideshare. Strategies for the University of Minnesota include:

- o Continue the provision of Route 52 service with the operating deficit split 50-50 basis between the University and the public sector. Examine the potential of expanding Route 52 service in the northern St. Paul suburbs of New Brighton, Arden Hills, Mounds View and Roseville; Highland Park; Golden Valley and New Hope; and Hopkins and Minnetonka.

- o Examine the possibility of lowering the cost of the Route 52 service through competitively bidding Route 52 service through the RTB's Competitive Bidding Demonstration.
- o Rideshare marketing efforts should be continued to be actively marketed through Minnesota Rideshare in coordination with the University of Minnesota Office of Transit.
- o The potential for preferential treatments for transit should be examined in and around the University. This should include evaluation of preferential parking for carpools and vanpools, bypass ramps, bus lanes, signal timing or pre-emption and Transportation System Management (TSM) options.
- o The potential for a minor transit hub should be examined. The most appropriate location for this appears to be in the vicinity of the existing Route 52 connection location at Church Street and Washington Avenue.
- o Continue to examine the potential for improved service to the University through major transit capital improvements along University Avenue.

Recommendation

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the University of Minnesota Market Analysis and Strategies contained in this memorandum for inclusion in the Transit Service Needs Assessment Final Report.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
292-8789

DATE: December 29, 1986
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Administration and Finance Committee
SUBJECT: A&F Committee Meeting Action Items

At its meeting December 18, 1986, the Administration and Finance Committee reviewed, discussed and moved the following:

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR MTC HIGH SUBSIDY ROUTES

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into contracts for the period February 1 through December 31, 1987 with Commuter Express, Inc. for operation of Route 25 Saturday service in an amount not to exceed \$12,751, and with International Express, Corporation for operation of Route 39 weekday service in an amount not to exceed \$18,325.

SUBJECT: 1986 EXURBAN SPECIAL PROJECT FUND AWARDS

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the award of 1986 Exurban Special Project funds to the Anoka County Transportation Coordination Program in an amount of \$5,000; the Senior Community Services-Delano Program in an amount of \$1,410; and the Westonka Rides Program in an amount of \$1,210.

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL METRO MOBILITY APPROPRIATION

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the plan outlined in the staff memorandum dated December 12, 1986 for use of the \$100,000 granted by the Legislative Advisory Commission to off-set the extra mileage costs to Metro Mobility users. This plan would be limited to \$100,000 and permit passengers to purchase commuter tickets at 25-percent of their face value to be used to pay for travel over eight miles.

A&F ITEMS
December 29, 1986
Page Two

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO HASTINGS COMMUTER EXPRESS SERVICE CONTRACT

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board approve amending the 1986 Hastings Commuter Express Service contract in the amount of \$9,889 for the period January 1 through March 31, 1987 in order for this program to complete its 12-month demonstration period.

OTHER BUSINESS

Andrews distributed, for informational purposes, copies of the memorandum from John Capell dated December 8, 1986 regarding the labor contract ratification at MTC.

Andrews noted that the RTB's Public Officials Liability Insurance expires on January 7, 1987 and that the next Administration and Finance Committee doesn't meet until the 8th. However, R.L. Youngdahl--our agent--will provide a binder to continue the coverage. This item will be on the agenda for the A&F meeting January 8th.

Andrews also summarized the status of the office space search. It has been decided to go with the Ameritus proposal. A meeting will be held December 23rd to approve a letter of intent.

The next meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee will be January 8 at 4:00 p.m.

Ruth Franklin
Chair

TRANSM/TX1

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: December 12, 1986
TO: Administration and Finance Committee
FROM: Edward Kouneski, Programs Manager *EK*
SUBJECT: Award of Contracts for MTC High Subsidy Routes

ACTION REQUESTED:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board approve authorizing the executive director to enter into contracts for the period February 1 through December 31, 1987 with Commuter Express, Inc. for operation of Route 25 Saturday services in an amount not to exceed \$12,751, and with International Express, Corporation for operation of Route 39 weekday service in an amount not to exceed \$18,325.

Discussion

The RTB solicited proposals for the contract service on two routes now operated at high subsidy-per-passenger* levels by the Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC): Route 25 (Silver Lake Rd.)--Saturday service and Route 39 (Apple Valley/Burnsville)--weekday service. An 11-month contract was proposed with two one-year options for extension.

During the initial 11-month contract period, from February 1 through December 31, 1987, a total of 483 revenue service hours will be operated on a restructured Route 25 and 515 revenue service hours will be operated on Route 39. The contract amounts shown in the staff recommendation are derived by multiplying the hourly rate bid by the number of revenue service hours to be operated, then adding the proposed start-up costs, if any.

Range of Bids

The range of bids, submitted on an annual (12-month) basis, are shown in the table on the following page. Please note that the annual amount listed for each bidder represents the proposed operating budget and does not include start-up costs. Start-up costs, if any were proposed, are displayed in a separate column.

Proposer	RANGE OF BIDS					
	Route 25 (Saturday)			Route 39 (Weekday)		
	Annual Amount	Hourly Rate	Start-Up Costs	Annual Amount	Hourly Rate	Start-Up Costs
Commuter Express	\$ 14,414	\$26.40	0	\$ 43,421	\$77.40	0
International Express Corp.	\$ 19,110	35.00	\$ 300	\$ 19,635	35.00	\$ 300
Medicine Lake Lines	\$ 16,527	30.27	6,000	\$ 41,707	74.34	6,000
Metropolitan Transit Commission	\$ 27,091	49.62	500	\$ 49,763	89.99	500
North Suburban Lines	\$ 18,613	34.09	0	No Bid	--	--
Osseo-Brooklyn School Bus Co.	No Bid	--	--	\$ 29,031	51.74	0
Voigt's Motorcoach Travel, Inc.	\$ 32,761	60.00	2,500	No Bid	--	--

Note: For comparison purposes, based on data from the MTC's May, 1986 route profile report, the annual operating cost for Route 25 (Saturday) was estimated at \$57,096 and for Route 39, \$50,490. These cost figures do not include the capital costs for vehicles. (Route 25 Saturday service will be restructured, reducing the current vehicle requirements from two to one.)

Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Based on review of the written information provided in the proposals, a five-member evaluation panel composed of RTB planning and programs staff rated and ranked each proposer on the following evaluation criteria:

- o The contractor's previous experience on projects of similar size, scope and complexity.
- o The qualifications of the key staff who will be assigned to the contract.
- o The availability of sufficient personnel, facilities and vehicles to comply with the contractual requirements.
- o The quality, age and condition of the proposed vehicles.
- o The contractor's demonstrated understanding of the services to be operated.
- o The contractor's approach to service implementation and operation, including the management plan, maintenance practices and operational methods.
- o The contractor's financial responsibility and ability to obtain financing, if necessary, for the proposed service.
- o The credibility of the detailed budget information and vehicle service hour rate bid.
- o The total price for operating the specified service levels during the contract period.

As shown by the evaluation criteria listed above, cost was not the sole consideration in evaluating the proposals, however, it was given the greatest emphasis in the overall rating.

Targeted Subsidy Level

The MTC reported subsidy-per-passenger levels of \$3.45 for Route 25 (Saturday) and \$4.10 for Route 39.

In order to bring these routes to operate within the \$2.45 ceiling subsidy per passenger standard, staff determined that it would be necessary to achieve operating costs savings of approximately 25-percent on Route 25 (Saturday) and 33-percent on Route 39.

Analysis of the bids showed that:

- o On Route 25, four proposers could perform the service within the targeted performance level: Commuter Express, International Express Corporation, Medicine Lake Lines, and North Suburban Lines.
- o On Route 39, two proposers could perform the service within the the targeted performance level: International Express Corporation and Osseo-Brooklyn School Bus Company.

In each case, staff is recommending the lowest bidder because of the quality of their proposals. Commuter Express and International Express Corporation each exhibited a strong understanding of the service to be provided.

Contractor Profiles

Commuter Express, Inc. is affiliated with St. Paul and Suburban Bus Company, Inc., which has 30 years of experience providing school and charter transportation services and deploys some 700 buses a day throughout the metropolitan area. Commuter Express would be operating from a facility located in New Brighton, one-half mile from the route. Commuter Express is currently under contract with the RTB to operate the Hastings Commuter Express service.

International Express Corporation, doing business as the Minneapolis and Suburban Airport Limousine Service, is a regular route common carrier authorized by the Public Utilities Commission to transport passengers between the International Airport and downtown Minneapolis, suburban hotels, motels and business places. Airport Limousine deploys 34 vehicles transporting nearly 300,000 passengers from or to the airport each year. In addition, the company operates charter service and has a shuttle service contract with the Metropolitan Airports Commission. The operational facilities of Airport Limousine are conveniently located in south Minneapolis.

Service Start Dates

Upon approval by the RTB board, service would be scheduled to start on the following dates:

- o Route 25 Saturday service -- February 7
- o Route 39 Weekday service -- February 2

Contract Provisions

Following are the anticipated contract provisions that would be incorporated into the standard RTB contract form.

- o Contract term: 11 months, with two 1-year options to extend.
- o Liability insurance: Minimum \$200,000 per claim and \$600,000 for any number of claims arising from a single occurrence.
- o Compensation method: Per vehicle service hour.
- o Farebox revenue: To be retained by contractor and deducted from monthly invoice.
- o Marketing: The responsibility of the contractor, with a maximum of \$5,000 per route available from the RTB for marketing and promotional activities, subject to RTB approval.

Proposal Requirements

For your information, below is a summary of the information prospective contractors were required to provide with their bids. Proposals were evaluated based on the response to these topics. By reference, the successful contractor's proposal document will be incorporated as part of the contract.

- o Statement of Understanding. Describe your understanding of the service to be provided for each of the routes that you propose to operate.
- o Approach to Management and Operations. Prepare a management plan that discusses your approach to operations in order to ensure reliable, on-time, cost-effective service. In your management plan, identify at least the following:
 - o The service performance goals and objectives that you would seek to meet.
 - o Key management processes including procedures to regularly monitor service performance and report ridership statistics and farebox revenues.
 - o Description of your training programs for newly hired drivers and mechanics and your ongoing safety and risk management programs. Describe your minimum qualifications for drivers and mechanics.
- o Discussion of proposed public information and marketing activities.

- o Organizational structure.
- o Key staff assigned to the project (include resumes) and their responsibilities.
- o A description of the location and facilities proposed for operations, maintenance, and administrative functions.
- o Vehicle Condition, Availability and Appearance. Describe the type of vehicles proposed for the services to be provided including the date of manufacture, model or type, mileage and odometer reading projected for when the vehicles would first be placed in service, additional equipment and features, seating capacity, current location, and ownership.
- o Maintenance Program. Specify your preventive maintenance program describing in detail the frequency and nature of inspections, and your repair and recordkeeping procedures. Attach copies of your vehicle inspection forms.
- o Experience/Past Performance. Provide information which demonstrates the relevant experience your company has to undertake this project including the number of years that your company has provided public transportation services, your company's safety record, the number and nature of similar ventures in which your company has been involved, and business references. In describing these services, please include the name and telephone number of the person responsible for administering your service contract on a daily basis. Include the number of vehicles operated, size of service area, number of service hours operated, and annual ridership.
- o Start-Up Plan. Provide a plan giving details explaining how start-up tasks will be performed, including a schedule for these tasks.
- o Financial Responsibility. Please provide information demonstrating to the RTB that your company has the necessary financial resources to perform the contract in a satisfactory manner including audited and current financial statements, bank and credit references.
- o Exceptions to RFP. Describe any exceptions to the RFP specifications that you would like to be considered by the RTB.

Findings and Conclusions

- o The RTB received six proposals for operation of Route 25, Saturday service and five proposals for operation of Route 39, weekday service.
- o Based on nine evaluation criteria, the proposals were rated and ranked by a five-member evaluation panel composed of RTB Planning and Programs staff.
- o In staff's view, the most responsive proposals--in terms of both price and quality--were submitted by Commuter Express for Route 25 and by International Express Corporation for Route 39.
- o Based on the cost proposals submitted by these firms, the financial performance of these high subsidy routes is expected to improve significantly and would fall well within the targeted subsidy level.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board approve authorizing the executive director to enter into contracts for the period February 1 through December 31, 1987 with Commuter Express, Inc. for operation of Route 25 Saturday services in an amount not to exceed \$12,751, and with International Express, Corporation for operation of Route 39 weekday service in an amount not to exceed \$18,325.

EKEVAL

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
292-8789

DATE: December 12, 1986
TO: Administration and Finance Committee
FROM: Cynthia Mayer, Project Administrator *CM Ek*
SUBJECT: 1986 Exurban Special Project Fund Awards

ACTION REQUESTED:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board authorize the award of 1986 Exurban Special Project funds to the Anoka County Transportation Coordination Program in an amount of \$5,000; the Senior Community Services-Delano Program in an amount of \$1,410; and the Westonka Rides Program in an amount of \$1,210.

Background

In March 1986, the Regional Transit Board adopted a two-staged process for the distribution of 1985 carry-over exurban funds. In the first stage, the RTB solicited exurban proposals based on the existing guidelines. As you know, twelve metropolitan area providers were awarded exurban funds to provide service to the elderly and handicapped. Now, in the second stage, a special exurban project has been developed and proposals for one-time funding commitments were solicited.

The use of the remaining 1985 exurban funds, which amount to approximately \$15,000, was to assist with the development of promotional materials such as brochures and posters for advertising and matching funds for capital purchases. In July, the City of Hastings was awarded special exurban funds for assistance in the purchase of a new vehicle plus miscellaneous costs for a farebox, the transfer of a radio and the application of their logo. The city was awarded 50-percent of the 20-percent match share for the purchase of a 16(b)(2) vehicle plus other miscellaneous costs for a total award of \$3,079.

When RTB solicited proposals for use of the carry-over 1985 exurban funds, it received a total of five requests including the City of Hastings. The other requests were from the Anoka County Transportation Coordination Program, Senior Community Services-Delano, Westonka Rides, and Community Volunteer Services.

The Anoka County Transportation Coordination Program is requesting funds to assist in the purchase of a 16 (b)(2) vehicle for the Linwood Senior Transportation Program in the amount of \$ 5,000. The provider is responsible for 20-percent of the total cost of the vehicle. The \$5,000 is half of that matching cost. By receiving a more reliable and larger capacity vehicle, Linwood Township will be able to increase their service area and ridership.

SPECIAL FUND AWARDS
December 12, 1986
Page Two

The Senior Community Services - Delano program is requesting funds to assist in the purchase of van lettering, brochure advertising, and a phone for their new vehicle in the amount of \$1,410. The phone for the van is the most cost effective solution for their remote rural communication problem. The advertising will help to promote their program.

Westonka Rides is requesting funds to obtain assistance for the development of promotional materials in the amount of \$ 1,210. This will help promote their new transportation service, which started in 1986. Westonka Rides serves a large geographic area. Much of the area is rural and isolated from both services and transportation. Wider distribution of information through the use of promotional material such as brochures, posters and local newspaper advertising. In addition, the program has purchased a new van which will need vehicle decals, striping and lettering.

The Community Volunteer Service program is not an RTB provider. Community Volunteer Services has been providing transportation services to the residents of Washington County since 1967. Transportation is provided by volunteer drivers using their own vehicles. CVS was contacted and the exurban program guidelines were explained to the coordinator, Kathy Miron. Staff explained that the funds were only available to existing exurban programs. Staff also explained that the Washington County Human Services program which is an RTB provider is willing to coordinate and cooperate with the CVS program. RTB staff expressed their willingness to extend technical assistance as needed.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board authorize the award of 1986 Exurban Special Project funds to the Anoka County Transportation Coordination Program in an amount of \$5,000; the Senior Community Services -Delano Program in an amount of \$1,410; and the Westonka Rides Program in an amount of \$1,210.

CMmisc

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: December 12, 1986
TO: Administration and Finance Committee
FROM: Mark Ryan, Project Administrator *MR* *ER*
SUBJECT: Implementation of Additional Metro Mobility Appropriation

ACTION REQUESTED:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board adopt the plan outlined in this memorandum that would permit Metro Mobility passengers to purchase commuter tickets at 25-percent of their face value to be used to pay for travel over eight miles.

Background

Earlier this year, the Regional Transit Board (RTB) adopted several changes to the Metro Mobility program. As part of the changes to the program, the base fare was increased to \$1.00 per trip, plus a maximum additional charge of \$2.75 was established for travel over eight miles.

To help offset the new extra mileage costs to Metro Mobility users, a request was made to the Legislative Advisory Commission (LAC) for interim (six-month) funding. The request was for \$100,000 and on November 13, the RTB was informed that the request had been granted.

Discussion

An important part of developing a plan for the use of the \$100,000 was to discuss options with the RTB's Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC). On December 9, a meeting of the THAC was held and options for the use of this additional funding were discussed.

Staff prepared two options for discussion at the THAC meeting. The first option would lower the maximum charge paid by users and increase the reimbursement rate to providers for those trips over eight miles. The second option would reimburse Metro Mobility passengers directly, up to a maximum amount, for travel over eight miles.

THAC members and participants from the audience discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the options. During the discussion, a third option was proposed and eventually supported by the THAC. The committee voted to recommend this option to the RTB by a vote of 9 to 1.

MM ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION

December 12, 1986

Page Two

Under the option adopted by THAC, Metro Mobility users would be able to purchase commuter tickets at a discount from the Metro Mobility Administrative Center (MMAC). It was recommended that the users purchase commuter tickets at one-half of their value. These discounted commuter tickets would be a different color from the existing tickets and could only be used to pay the passenger fare charged by providers over eight miles. Providers would accept these special commuter tickets and will be reimbursed for the full value of the ticket.

Under this option, the following steps would need to be taken:

- Metro Mobility users will be notified of the availability of discounted commuter tickets for travel over eight miles.
- Commuter tickets, in denominations of \$.50 and \$1.00, will be printed in a different color than those currently being used. Additionally, the discounted tickets will be shaped differently to assist those with visual impairments in distinguishing between the two types of tickets.
- Providers will be notified of the discounted commuter tickets that will be accepted for travel over eight miles.
- Metro Mobility users will purchase the discounted commuter tickets using the same system that is currently in place at the MMAC.
- Staff at the MMAC will be responsible for verifying the proper use of the tickets and will reimburse providers under the same procedure that is in place for the current commuter tickets.
- RTB and MTC staff will develop an agreement on the transfer of funds to the MTC that will pay for the difference between the amount collected for the tickets and the full value of the ticket.
- It is expected that tickets would be available to Metro Mobility users in January.

To arrive at an estimated cost for this option, certain assumptions were made to estimate the number of trips over eight miles. Under the former Metro Mobility program, it was estimated that 15-percent of all trips were over eight miles.

Under the current program, it has become much easier for people to use the service and transfers are no longer necessary. Additionally, if the cost for longer trips is reduced, it is expected that more people will travel longer distances. It is expected that this combination will make longer trips more attractive for Metro Mobility users. Therefore, it is estimated that 25-percent of all Metro Mobility trips will be over eight miles. For the trips over eight miles, it is estimated that 33-percent will be nine miles, 33-percent will be ten miles, and 33-percent will be eleven miles or more.

The estimated cost for the option adopted by the THAC is presented in Table 1 attached to this memorandum. The information in the table summarizes the total number of trips by trip distance, shows the total cost for travel over eight miles and outlines both estimated passenger and additional subsidy costs under two different payment plans for users.

The costs represented in Table 1 do not account for the cost of administering the program. Since a process already exists to sell commuter tickets to Metro Mobility passengers, it is assumed that no additional administrative costs will occur. The cost for printing the commuter tickets and notifying Metro Mobility users will be paid for out of the existing Metro Mobility budget.

Assuming the added administrative costs will be absorbed in the existing budget, it is estimated that the six month additional cost for the option of Metro Mobility passengers paying 50-percent of the value of the commuter tickets would be \$77,265. If the Metro Mobility passengers were to pay 25-percent of the value of the tickets, then it is estimated the cost of the program would be \$115,831 for a six month period.

Before selecting one of the two approaches, an additional factor should be discussed. Currently, only six of the nineteen Metro Mobility providers are charging passengers for travel over eight miles. If this practice were to continue, then passenger costs for travel over eight miles would be much less than projected.

While the six month cost of the option under which Metro Mobility passengers would pay 25-percent of the value of a commuter ticket is estimated at \$15,831 more than the LAC appropriation, the current practice of Metro Mobility providers not charging for travel over eight miles suggests that the actual cost may be much less.

Since Metro Mobility users would have the greatest benefit by purchasing their tickets at the lowest possible rate and many of the Metro Mobility providers are not charging for travel over eight miles, implementing the option under which users can purchase commuter tickets at 25-percent of their value seems most attractive.

Findings and Conclusions

- The Legislative Advisory Commission has granted the RTB an additional \$100,000 for the Metro Mobility program that is to be used to off-set the additional passenger costs of travel over eight miles.
- On December 9, 1986, the RTB's Transportation Handicapped Advisory Committee (THAC) met and discussed options for the use of the additional funding.

MM ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION

December 12, 1986

Page Four

- The THAC recommended an option that would allow Metro Mobility users to purchase special commuter tickets at a discount and those discounted tickets would be used to pay for travel over eight miles.
- Six of the nineteen Metro Mobility providers are currently charging passengers for travel over eight miles.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board adopt the plan outlined in this memorandum that would permit Metro Mobility passengers to purchase commuter tickets at 25-percent of their face value to be used to pay for travel over eight miles.

Attachment
MERANF

Table 1

ESTIMATED ANNUAL COSTS OF METRO MOBILITY DISCOUNTED
COMMUTER TICKET PROGRAM

	<u>Trip Length (Miles)</u>			<u>Annual Total for Trips Over Eight Miles</u>
	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11 and Over</u>	
Estimated Percentage of Trips Over 8 Miles (By Mile)	33%	33%	33%	--
Estimated Number of Annual Trips*	53,750	53,750	53,750	161,250
Maximum Metro Mobility Mileage Rate	\$1.00	\$2.00	\$2.75	--
Maximum Total Passenger Cost for Travel Over Eight Miles	\$53,750	\$107,500	\$147,813	\$309,063
Commuter Tickets at 50% of Value				
Passenger Costs	\$26,875	\$ 53,750	\$ 73,906	\$154,531
Add'l Subsidy Costs	\$26,875	\$ 53,750	\$ 73,906	\$154,531
Commuter Tickets at 25% of Value				
Passenger Costs	\$13,437	\$ 26,875	\$ 37,088	\$ 77,400
Add'l Subsidy Costs	\$40,312	\$ 80,625	\$110,725	\$231,662

*Based on 645,000 trips annually and 25% of all trips are over 8 miles.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
292-8789

DATE: December 12, 1986
TO: Administration and Finance Committee
FROM: Edward Kouneski, Programs Manager
SUBJECT: Amendment to Hastings Commuter Express Service Contract

ACTION REQUESTED:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board approve authorization to amend the 1986 Hastings Commuter Express Service contract in the amount of \$9,889 for the period January 1 through March 31, 1987 in order for this program to complete its 12-month demonstration period.

Discussion

On December 15, 1986, the Regional Transit Board authorized funding for the Hastings Commuter Express program in the amount of \$19,964 for calendar year 1987. This award was contingent upon the City of Hastings willingness to match the 50-percent local match needed for exurban funding.

The City of Hastings originally contributed \$13,881 to the Hastings Commuter Express program for calendar year 1986 with the understanding that it was a one-time funding commitment. Service started in April, 1986. It was anticipated, falsely, by the private operator that the service would eventually not require a subsidy. At this time, the city does not intend to devote any additional funds to the project.

The Hastings Commuter Express program, as of December 31, 1986, will have completed 9 months of its 12-month demonstration period. Service has shown steadily increasing ridership. As of November, the service carries approximately 30 passengers per one-trip, or 60 passengers daily. The daily subsidy per passenger is averaging approximately \$2.60.

Staff is recommending that the Hastings Commuter Express Service program be 100-percent funded with exurban dollars to continue its service through the 12 month demonstration period. In the meantime, Hastings Commuter Express Service and the City of Hastings will be working mutually to establish better understanding and integration of service and will explore funding possibilities for a long term commitment for continuation beyond the 12 month demonstration period.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Administration and Finance Committee recommend the board approve authorization to amend the 1986 Hastings Commuter Express Service contract in the amount of \$9,889 for the period January 1 through March 31, 1987 in order for this program to complete its 12-month demonstration period.

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
292-8789

DATE: December 29, 1986
TO: Regional Transit Board
FROM: Administration and Finance Committee
SUBJECT: A&F Committee Meeting Action Items

At its meeting December 18, 1986, the Administration and Finance Committee reviewed, discussed and moved the following:

SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACTS FOR MTC HIGH SUBSIDY ROUTES

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the executive director to enter into contracts for the period February 1 through December 31, 1987 with Commuter Express, Inc. for operation of Route 25 Saturday service in an amount not to exceed \$12,751, and with International Express, Corporation for operation of Route 39 weekday service in an amount not to exceed \$18,325.

SUBJECT: 1986 EXURBAN SPECIAL PROJECT FUND AWARDS

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board authorize the award of 1986 Exurban Special Project funds to the Anoka County Transportation Coordination Program in an amount of \$5,000; the Senior Community Services-Delano Program in an amount of \$1,410; and the Westonka Rides Program in an amount of \$1,210.

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL METRO MOBILITY APPROPRIATION

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board adopt the plan outlined in the staff memorandum dated December 12, 1986 for use of the \$100,000 granted by the Legislative Advisory Commission to off-set the extra mileage costs to Metro Mobility users. This plan would be limited to \$100,000 and permit passengers to purchase commuter tickets at 25-percent of their face value to be used to pay for travel over eight miles.

A&F ITEMS
December 29, 1986
Page Two

SUBJECT: AMENDMENT TO HASTINGS COMMUTER EXPRESS SERVICE CONTRACT

Recommendation:

That the Regional Transit Board approve amending the 1986 Hastings Commuter Express Service contract in the amount of \$9,889 for the period January 1 through March 31, 1987 in order for this program to complete its 12-month demonstration period.

OTHER BUSINESS

Andrews distributed, for informational purposes, copies of the memorandum from John Capell dated December 8, 1986 regarding the labor contract ratification at MTC.

Andrews noted that the RTB's Public Officials Liability Insurance expires on January 7, 1987 and that the next Administration and Finance Committee doesn't meet until the 8th. However, R.L. Youngdahl--our agent--will provide a binder to continue the coverage. This item will be on the agenda for the A&F meeting January 8th.

Andrews also summarized the status of the office space search. It has been decided to go with the Ameritus proposal. A meeting will be held December 23rd to approve a letter of intent.

The next meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee will be January 8 at 4:00 p.m.

Ruth Franklin
Chair

TRANSM/TX1

REGIONAL TRANSIT BOARD

Suite 270 Metro Square Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101

DATE: January 5, 1987
TO: Elliott Perovich, Chairman; and Members, Regional Transit Board
FROM: Alison Fuhr, Member

As you are aware and as I mentioned at the retreat, I have concerns about our singling out University Avenue on which to do preliminary engineering. For one thing, it lacks a system approach. And secondly, it leaves the rest of the system open to challenge if someone else comes along with a better idea. Thirdly, in the overall context, it dilutes our authority and approval. I would like to see us as the authority defining the system, e.g., the already-studied 35 miles, the two corridors recently prioritized by the Metropolitan Council, the four corridors (including the Northwest Hennepin County Corridor), or the five corridors as outlined in our needs assessment. Then we could send that system out for bids. This way we would maintain control. The system definition would not only include the corridors, but would also delineate such things as where the lines would interact, the common elements of those lines, the yards and shops, the electrification, the criteria for design for stations, and perhaps more importantly, how it would interact with the bus system.

The bidding then could take two forms. Either several consortia could bid in competition for the whole system or parts of the system could be bid separately. This, then, would allow Hennepin County and Bombardier (the sole source might be questioned) to come in and bid on perhaps 15 miles as a pilot program. In the RFP we would have reserved the right to approve what was happening at various stages of the evolution of the process.

We would have pinned down how the contractor proposed to pay for what he/she is proposing, where his/her financing was coming from, how he/she proposed to interact with the other elements of the system. I understand that there are model proposals that we could borrow to facilitate the process, to shorten the time of our staff and the resources of our agency.

My premise is that we could very well eliminate the need for asking the legislature for a large amount of money. Hennepin County is telling the world "We don't need to ask the state for money. We can do it on our own." That's all well and good, but in what context would they be building? We want to be darn sure that the system has been defined first. Then they could do what they wanted to do. And what if the legislature sees our proposal for \$3.5 million and Hennepin County says they don't need anything? Who might come out ahead? The amount we would ask for would be for "spec" time.

Regional Transit Board
January 5, 1987
Page Two

My other hope is that we could avoid asking the "feds" for anything. State Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) would be faster to process than federal ones. EISs would probably have to be done on anything proposed that is beyond the 35 miles already studied and approved.

This is why I feel that there is no reason for us to home in one, exclusively, University Avenue.

Upon reflection, it occurs to me that this is the way highway projects are handled so the process should not be a new one to the legislature.

The effect of my proposal then is that RTB (and the Council) would be in charge with no one questioning that authority. The RFPs would be under our control no matter who submitted bids and we would be the approving authority as the process evolved. And we would be saving money and our time.

I would appreciate it if you would consider this proposal as a whole board or refer it to the Policy Committee for further dissection. I feel if we don't act quickly, the ball might be taken out of our court.

mf111A